United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

September 2008

Public Comments and Agency Responses

Travel Management Project EA

Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest

For Information Contact: Joan Marburger
Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest Supervisor's Office
1170 4th Avenue South
Park Falls, WI 54552
715-762-5178

This is a controlled document:
The official version is located in the project record at the Chequamegon-Nicolet Forest Supervisor's Office.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Comments and Agency Responses for the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest Travel Management Project EA

Before You Read This Document

This document contains comments received during the 30-day comment period for our Travel Management Project on the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest (CNNF, or simply the Forest). Many of the comments reflect personal values and viewpoints. I am not surprised by the passion expressed in these comments, as these public lands are important to American citizens for a variety of purposes. Access to the National Forest is something that goes hand-in-hand with being able to utilize the Forest.

What follows is a comprehensive consideration and response to every comment I received during this comment period. We strived to offer thoughtful explanations of the process we used to engage people for this project. You will note that many of our responses encourage people to continually engage us and submit specific information about their access to the Forest. We have relied tremendously on this information to make our decision – we will continue to do so as we update the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM).

A total of 388 letters, three resolutions, and 95 oral comments were received during the comment period of the CNNF Travel Management Plan. These communications contained 967 individual comments. Many of the comments were similar and only stated a preference for a particular alternative. In cases where similar comments were made, one response was made by the Forest and referenced throughout the remainder of the document.

Some comment letters were lengthy, and contained multiple comments pertaining to the project. Therefore, responses to these specific comments have been separated out within this document to adequately address the commenter's concern. We have attempted to respond specifically to each of these comments by these smaller units presented; however, due to the nature of how the letters were written and how they have been subsequently split, the reader should read the entire set of all the responses to that specific letter to fully understand the context of the comments and responses. All comments, except for those taken in person or over the phone, are directly quoted from their source.

Directly following is a complete list of all respondents to the Travel Management Project EA during the comment period. Commenters have been assigned a letter number; comments are displayed by letter number with individual comments identified by a combination of letter number-comment number. All comments and Agency responses begin on page 7, following the list of respondents.

Commenter Name/Affiliation by Letter Number

Note: Some letter numbers are noted. Those noted with "1" are form letters with identical comments as letter 256; those with a "2" are form letters with identical comments as letter 455. Please refer to those letters for detailed responses.

179	Lawrence Zihell
180	Joe Palmer
181	Jerry Merryfield/Bayfield Conservation Congress
182	William Chwala
183	Mark Brault
184	Ron Kerscher
185	Betty Ann Kolesar
186	Gary Laack
187	Bob Helgemo
188	Craig Lemke
189	Dan Cobb
190	Eric Peters
191	Jeff Filipiak
193	Ken Anderson
194	Michael Schindler
195	Nancy Atwater
196	Patrick Healy
197	Peter Eisch
198	Russ Amans
199	Russ Wanke
200	Steven May, Susan Rose
201	William Moore
202	Doug Peterson
203	Eric Judy
204	dsolberg@wi.rr.com
205	Patricia Lendvend
206	Leonard Schrank
207	John Bates
208	Rick Larson
209	Steven Metz
210	Wyatt Repavich
211	William Draves
212	Warren Irie
213	Steve Wise/ WI Dual Sport Riders
214	Steve Luccioni
215	Ryan Allison
216	Rudy Heinle
217	Paul Ferman
218	Patsy Dewitt
219	Norm Kitzman
220	Mike Joyce
221	Mike Feldner
222	Michael Pearson
223	Nancy Collins
224	Merl Lang
226	Leo Kramer
227	Larry Kammerzelt
228	Kenneth Brunner
229	Keith Schnick
230	Jim Gabrielson
231	Jerry Rintamaki
232	Gordon Flannery
233	George Roogers
234	George Meyer/Wisconsin Wildlife Federation
235	Gary Lapp
236	Fred Marcell
237	Erica Ravenhorn
238	Eric Kammerzelt
239	Elvin & Sarah Busjahn
240	Elvin & Sarah Busjahn
241	Ken Douglas
242	Don Henke/ Florence Co. ATV Coordinator
243	David Parker
244	David Kuckkan
245	Dan Henschel
246	Paul Stieff
247	Catherine Cooper
248	Bruce Broker
249	Andy Schaffer
250	Allen Rebek
251	Kurt Flack
252	Lee Swanson
254	Marc Bowe
255	Sandra Gillum
256	J.O. Erb
257	Jerry Hennes
258	Tom Getchman
259	John Ehlers
260	Gary Laack
261	Wayne Schroeder
262	David LeFebvre
263	Charles Monner
264	Brian & Andrea Metz
265	John Huston
266	Gene Graunke
267	F.S. Gombar
268	Harry Griswold
269	Elvin and Sarah Busjahn
270	Dave Puhl
271	Thomas Hill
272	Scott Zantow
273	Randy Armsbury/ Jenks Bait & Tackle
274	Jerry Adamovich
277	Alan Delaski
278	Carl Veller
279	Charlie & Dana Johnson
280 [1]	David Murphy
281 [1]	Lou George
282 [1]	G.C. Kleckner
283 [1]	Scott Jenks
284	Sue Drum
285	Jason Duehring
287	Mark Kossik
288	Jim Middlebrook
289	Garry King
290	Michael Zeckmeister
291	Joel Gaber

292 Nan & Jim
293 davidda@centurytel.net
294 [1] Terri Aarestad
295 [1] Duane Acker
296 [1] Paula Carlson
297 [1] Nolan and Juliane Caswell
298 [1] Lauri Lisiwith
299 [1] Petit & Dommershausen, SC
300 [1] Keith Halliday
301 [1] Jeff Labudda
302 [1] Resident
303 [1] Pete Nieland
304 [1] Wnedy Rosenthal
305 [1] Karl Schoenfeld
306 [1] Matthew Smith
307 [1] Resident
308 [1] Joanne & Brian Wayner
309 [1] Joanne & Brian Wayner
310 [1] Eric Schoenfeld
311 Randall Armsbury
312 Dick & Alice Ketelboeter
313 Lowell Kirchenwitz
314 Gregg Kuetemeyer
315 James Mecklenburg
316 John Myhre
317 Jim Onarheim
318 Gerald Rintamaki
319 David Turnbull
320 Mike Williams
322 Ed Schmocker/ Winterwoods
323 George Artja
324 Dave Green & Rod Sabin
326 Colleen & Greg Neff/ Neff's Northern Evergreens
327 Dr. Steve Kagen/ U.S. House of Representatives
328 Matt Schultz
329 Dan Ruck
330 Gregory Ollila
331 Russ Schroeder
332 Tom Tiffany
333 Roger Steinbach
334 Ron Anderson/ Mad City Jeep Abusers
335 Lance David
336 Duane Baer
337 Dona Ermer
338 Alex Bub/ WI Off-Highway Motorcycle Assn.
339 Phil Lubinski
340 Travis & Joann Lubinski
341 Janice & Jonathan Kostreva
342 Ernest Martinson
343 Craig Weitermann
345 Mike Joyce
346 Mark Pringle
347 George Meyer/WI Wildlife Federation
348 Kenneth Brunner
349 Robert Springer
350 Jeff Krom/ HLV Motorcycles
351 Jim Williams
352 Tom & Michelle Kohler
353 John Myhre
354 Mark Wefler
355 Jerry Davis
356 James Esser
357 Peter Drill
358 Paul Kleinschmidt
359 Scott Schultz
360 Derek Opgenorth
361 Luana Schneider/ Wisconsin 4 Wheel Drive Assn.
362 Jeff Bajczyk
363 Kevin Johnson
364 Ludwig Habada
365 Donald Cornue
366 Donald Cornue
367 Mark Huesdens
368 John Kolar
369 Kathy & Martin Kascewicz
370 Leo Schneider
371 Lynn Malek
372 Lynn Malek
373 Duane Baer
374 Rob Stafsholt
375 Linda Novak
376 Kenneth Schuck/ AMA District 15 Council
377 Kathryn Drew
378 Dale Crisler/Ice Age Park & Trail Foundation
379 Walter Jackson
380 Margo & Bill Perkins
381 Joel Gabler
382 John Gee
383 Gary Salatnik
384 John Hecht
385 Jerry Davis
386 Jim Hoffman
387 Anthony Lulloff
388 Marlene & Richard Hogue
389 Randy Harden/ Wisconsin ATV Association
390 Bob Schuhardt
391 Gene Gruber
392 Byron Miller
393 Les Pauls
394 Ray Booth
395 Jerry & Sue Haas
396 Mark Hutchings
397 Don Erickson
398 M. James Nemec
399 Jef Spalding
400 Edward Heyes
401 Kathleen Gerds
402 David Smith
403 Dan Allen/ Elk Country Riders
404 Rich Good
405 Lamont Bygd
406 [1] Alice Ketelborter
407 Ronda Okus
408 Jerry Ross
409 Nancy Rhode
410 Paul Thompson
411 Mike Williams
412 Jack Dudley
413 Fred Goebel
414 Al Lobner
415 Larry Rietbrock

416 Dick Blum
417 David Shaw
418 Steve Holmes
419 Jim Sauer
420 Tom Grall
421 Rita Moore
422 Dennis Sechen
423 Robert Vlasaty
424 Thomas Koleski
425 Mena Empy
426 Ted Anderson
427 Alan Elverson
428 George Petry
429 David Bender
430 Edward Piontek
431 Kathy & Martin Kascewicz
432 Michael Ingram
433 Steve Bishop
434 Kenneth Brunner
435 James Kubinek
436 Duane Jenson
437 Wayne Lerand
438 David Turnbull
439 Robert Bailey
440 Steve Kagen/US House of Representatives
441 Rosemary McCarthy
442 Tom Tallier
443 Dolores Lambert
444 Jim Lambert
445 Stephen & Judith Suhs
446 Dennis Sugers
447 Glen Reed
448 [2] David & Joann Withers, Panfish Sales
449 Sheryl Pethers
450 Larry Kammerzelt
451 Chip Mosser
452 Wayne Schroeder
453 Victor Milhans
454 Gary Zimmer/ Ruffed Grouse Society
455 Mark Stephens
456 [2] Nick Hanley
457 [2] Dean Clemens
458 [2] Teresa Hartmann
459 [2] Tom Hartman
460 [2] Carl and Leticia Swensonn
461 [2] Mark Davis
462 [2] Dale Maddy
463 [2] David Quale
464 [2] Rita &Louis Spahn
465 [2] Charles Cady
466 [2] Donald Pertzborn
467 [2] Robin Bong
468 [2] Mark Meinholz
469 [2] Clara & Michael Meier
471 [2] Rick Ballweg
472 [2] Jim Meier
473 [2] Julie Frey
474 [2] Lawrence & Lyn Morris
475 [2] Linda, Dave & Angie Knoche/Speedway Snowmoblie Club
476 [2] Linda, Dave & Angie Knoche/Speedway Snowmoblie Club
477 [2] Linda, Dave & Angie Knoche/Speedway Snowmoblie Club
478 [2] Mike Frey
479 [2] Ron Peebles
480 [2] Bill & Sharen Frontzak
481 [2] Karen Kessenich
482 [2] Dave Sarbacker
483 [2] Michele Endres
484 [2] Dean Breunig
485 [2] Craig & Brenda Hahn
486 [2] Suzy Krantz
487 [2] Randy Krantz
488 [2] Rita & Louie Spahn
489 Jim & Terry Fabian
490 Fred Strand
491 Bryan Much
492 Anthony Cypcar
493 Diane Muri
494 Mike Adamovich
495 Erhard Huettl/ Forest Co. Board of Supv's
496 Jerry Knuth
497 Richard Olson
498 Lil Pipping/Wisconsin Wildlife Federation
499 Tom Rulseh
500 Ryan Allison
501 Robert Dall
502 James Francis
503 Orv Langhor/Lakes States Resource Alliance
504 John Reinemann/Wisconsin Counties
505 Heather Garland
506 Gene Strehlow
507 Robert Knorr
508 Neil Beckman
509 Thomas Rossberger
510 Mike Risner
511 Terry Withrow
512 Tony & Bill Kokan
513 Cathy Midwood
514 George Artka
515 James Francis
516 Matt Remec/ RCE Ltd.
517 Mary Motiff/ Bayfield Co. Tourism & Recreation
518 Joanne Hannigan
519 Larry Dallman
520 William Zabel
521 Jef Crom
522 Great Lakes Timber Professionals Assn
523 Peter Drill
524 Matthew Frank/ Wisconsin DNR
525 Elroy Zemke/ Wisconsin County Forests Assn.
526 Marlene & Richard Hogue
527 Quin Fuerstein
529 Richard Connor/ Pine River Lumber Co.
530 Nat. Wild Turkey Federation
531 Ron Larson
532 David Schwanz
533 Jenny Gubbin
534 Dan Iverson
535 Bob Welch/ WI Hunter Rights Coalition

536 fivesranch@q.com
537 Richard Belke
538 Laura Degolier
539 Dave Newman
540 Thomas Rossberger
541 James & Carol Dunn
542 Julie Urban
543 Scott Manning
544 Neil Paulson
545 William Sloey
546 Bob & Carol Lepowski
547 Brenda Dehne
548 Merle Lang
549 Bill Betts
550 Larry Kammerzelt
552 Howard Ingram
553 Sandra Lewis & Kathleen Rivera
554 Michael Riggle/ Taylor Co. Sportsmans Club
555 Trent Harris
556 Jim Nonn
557 Art Noot
558 Gary Pajonk
559 Bonnie Anderson
560 Tom Vanden Elzen
561 Ryan Allison
562 Brad Garland
563 Tom Frels
564 John Schnorr/ Wisconsin OHV Assn.
566 Richard Cechal
567 John & Lani Holdorf
568 Edgar Harvey/ Wisconsin Conservation Congress
569 Gene Adamovich
570 Carrie Garland
571 Daniel Hefty
572 Joe Schartner
573 Ron Adamovich
574 George Meyer/WI Wildlife Federation
575 Barry Wirth
576 Robert Rasmussen
577 Town of Townsend
578 John Hawksford
579 Earl Orner
580 Eugene Krause/ Town of Spider Lake
581 Ralph & Annette Thyssen
582 John Brantmeier/ Red Arrow Snowmobile ATV Club
583 Randy Buss
584 Lynne & Todd Johnson
585 Larry Stevens/ Vilas Co. Forestry, Recreation & Land
586 William DeVries/ Drummond Township
588 Richard Krawze
589 Peter Albrecht
590 William Christianson
591 snopros@derbytrack.com
592 Glen Hoffman
593 Joe Harner/ Outdoor Allure
594 Bob Blaszkowski
595 John Kupsh
597 [1] Wendy Jordenson
603 Ray Kruschke
604 Tom Materch
605 Angie Tornes
606 Keith Cauwenbergh
607 Scott Hart
608 Mark Pringle
609 Tom Christianson
610 Dan Vanhoosen
611 Tim Wilmet
612 Mike Hartmon
613 Richard Tjardes
614 Jeff Hammer
615 David Good
616 Barry Wallace
617 Joel Schlitz
618 Gary Edinger
619 Curt Weese
620 Joe Jacobson
621 Jon Lohman
622 Cecil Becker
623 Ralph Blum
624 Jerry Erdmann
625 Chris Volk
626 Tony Irwin
627 Dave Ariola
628 Jim Schmidt
629 Darin Ides/ Busch Machinery Org.
630 Alan Frey
631 Raymond Redlin
632 Kim Kost
633 John Ruppel
634 Todd Wilber
635 Larry Wanta
636 Mark Charlton
637 Eugene Perronne
638 Mark Hassler
639 Michael Pherson
640 Mark Massey
641 Eric Schumacher
642 Paul Biersack
643 Kyle Pauls
644 Susan Thorpe
645 Mark Hoffman
646 Mary Ann Picard
647 David Frogner
648 Nate Nelson
649 Andrew Zovnic
650 Lowell Kirchenwitz
651 Ed Mathwig
652 Gregory Hoffman
653 Tom Warth
654 Keith Taylor
655 Jim Land
656 John Loehlen
657 Timothy Blank
658 Todd Spagnoletti
659 Dave Rehlinger
660 Thomas Somrak
661 John Schmitt
662 Brian Bennett
663 G.A. Mason
664 Gary Sanders
665 Daniel Delasky

666 John Rettler
667 Jim & Jean Topercer
668 Dave Anhalt
669 Tony Pettijean
670 Harlow Scherf
671 Tim Raupp
672 Matt Schumacher
673 Dave Phillips
674 Bob Schmidt
675 Jeff Simons
676 [2] Deb Peart
677 Shirley Brose
678 Stacy Backhaus
680 Dave Florek
681 Dr. James Earl Kennamer/Natl. Wild Turkey Foundation
683 [2] Randy Smith
2535 William Czeskleba
2861 Bob Welch/WI Hunter Rights Coalition
3255 Brenda Lindquist/Nature's All LLC

Comments and Agency Responses by Letter Number

Letter-Comment Number	Comment and Response
179-1	**Comment:** *I would like you to keep open the "undetermined" roads in the Scott Creek Ruffed Grouse Habitat area. I am glad to see you responding better to the wishes of the public in your reconsideration.* **Response:** Thank you for your interest in the Scott Creek area. A number of the roads in the Scott Creek Hunter Walking Trail System will remain available for motorized vehicle travel. These include roads 3155, 3155A, 3156, 3156A, 2109, 3737, 3738, and 3910, as well as HWY 32 that bisects the area. The roads that are currently unavailable to motorized use within this hunter trail system will remain unavailable to vehicles, but will remain available for walking hunters. Eighteen road segments currently available to motorized use would be made unavailable to motorized use under the decision on this project. The longest of these road segments (Road 616320) is approximately one-half mile and most are less than a quarter-mile; therefore, grouse hunters would not have to walk very far. All of the roads within this hunter trail system would continue to provide hunting opportunity, but more of these roads/trails will be not be open to motorized travel. If there are specific roads in this area that are important to you for motorized access, please let us know. The more specific you can be the better we can address your needs.
180-1	**Comment***: It seems as if you are at it again. How do you think those of us with disabilities will be able to use (our) forest. I feel that this is directed at all of us that must use wheelchairs to get around. You want wolves more than us. As a Forest Service employee told me you'll just have to hunt on private land. This forest is part mine; I want to be able to use it. How arrogant you appear to me. What about the guys coming home from Iraq? They are Americas best, but if they come back with a disability they can no longer enjoy the forest. I am asking that you do not allow this change to our National Forest.* **Response** Thank you for your comment and concern. The Forest Service welcomes all people, including individuals who have disabilities, to the National Forests and Grasslands. Outdoor recreation is about individual choice, including the type of recreation opportunity and the type of access. We can help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We also can direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences: easy access and the sense of remoteness. We are committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking. In this project, the Travel Management Project, we are designating National Forest System roads and trails for motor vehicle use as directed by the National Travel Management Rule. The motor vehicle use designation decisions are made through a planning process with public participation that evaluates current and potential impacts due to the operation of specific vehicle types on natural and cultural resources, public safety, recreation opportunities, conflict among uses and access needs. Individuals who use a wheelchair to aid in mobility are permitted to take that device anywhere foot traffic is allowed, including in designated wilderness. A wheelchair is defined according to 36 CFR 212.2, Forest Service Manual 2350.5 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Title V, Section 507(c) as any device, including one that is

	battery-powered, that is designed solely for use by a mobility-impaired person for locomotion, and that is suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area. We encourage anyone with disabilities or restricted ability to contact us to discuss the type of experience they are seeking (such as fishing and dispersed camping) and their means of access and we will help them locate an area that best suits their recreational needs. Your ability to use the Forest is important to us. We encourage you to stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). The more specific you can be the better we can address your needs. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
181-1	**Comment***: I wish to express my displeasure with the project to close many miles of roads with the forest's .There are many reasons that this would cause problems in the area of the Chequamegon Forest where I live. I am sure you will hear them all. But the thing I am concerned about with the closure of all these miles of road probably will mean a reduction of people who were used to using these trails for hunting, bird watching, biking, this will effect the business's here in my area. It's tough enough to attract them to this area with deer numbers down, now the closure could result in more people staying home. I can see a few roads being closed for various reasons, but 2700 miles is all wrong.* **Response:** Thank you for your input. Our decision will continue to provide plenty of access and will not close roads the majority of the people use to access the National Forest. The roads that will be unavailable for motorized use are those that may normally require a four-wheel drive vehicle to access. These roads may be important for some people to access certain areas. It will be important for people to let us know what and where these roads are so we can consider whether they should be added to the motor vehicle use map (MVUM). We do recognize that motorized recreation is controversial in Wisconsin (see Recreation report). Some people would like more motorized recreation opportunities while other people would like more non-motorized recreation opportunities. We will continue to monitor recreation, motorized use, and associated impacts to surrounding economies. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
181-2	**Comment:** *I think you need to conduct public hearings again to hear first hand from those of us that live here.* **Response:** We agree wholeheartedly that public involvement is very important in the development of alternatives for proposed actions on Forest lands. We held 15 open houses in 2007 to solicit public input on specific roads. Ten open houses were held in January and February 2007, five for the public and five for governmental entities. Five open houses were held in October 2007 to present our initial proposal to the public and to solicit additional comments. The Public Involvement section of the EA (page 5) also describes the process the Forest Service used to inform and involve the public for this project. In addition, we sent press releases to an extensive statewide media list that includes newspapers, television stations, and radio stations. We will continue to provide opportunities for the public to provide input to the map as it is updated each year. The more specific the feedback the better we can accommodate people's needs and interests. We encourage you to stay engaged.
181-3	**Comment***: Register my vote as no to the number you are proposing*. **Response:** The Forest Service has identified unmanaged recreation, particularly the unmanaged use of OHVs as one of the four

	threats facing National Forests and Grasslands today. OHVs are a legitimate use of the National Forest System; however, this use should be managed carefully to ensure protection of other resources such as impacts to soil, water, wildlife habitat, and other recreational visitors. The intent of the proposed changes in OHV management on National Forests is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. These changes also allow for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. The Travel Management Rule requires each National Forest to designate roads, trails, and areas that are open to public motor vehicle use. The process of identification of roads that meet these needs is outlined in this project's Environmental Assessment (EA), and results in a road system that is (1) safe and responsive to public needs and desires, (2) affordable and efficiently managed, (3) has minimal negative ecological effect on the land, and (4) is in balance with available funding for needed management actions. Many people like yourself expressed an opinion in clear support of, or opposition to, one of the alternatives considered in the EA. Each alternative reflects a compromise between recreational use and resource protection. We read each of your comments and took them into consideration in our decision. We believe the selection of Alternative 3(as modified) best meets your needs by providing a network of roads and trails that is accessible and sustainable. We believe this alternative better addresses the need for access than Alternative2, because it provides more opportunities for access where access can be sustained. It also allows for increased access during the fall hunting season while balancing the need for non-motorized use. Choosing Alternative 1 at this time would be irresponsible. If we choose to do nothing and allow the current motor vehicle use to occur unmanaged, we believe that your enjoyment of the National Forest will decrease while the environmental impacts would likely increase. Designating roads for motorized use without site-specific information and validation may have unintended consequences. Alternative 3 (as modified) provides a more appropriate process for reviewing and designating additional roads not yet considered (unauthorized roads). Putting all the unauthorized roads that have not been evaluated onsite on the map may lead to increased environmental damage that in some cases could be irreversible. Please see the Decision Notice for a full description of our decision and rationale. The use of the adaptive management process will allow us to continue to evaluate unauthorized roads that have not yet been brought to our attention or to address other areas of concern. We encourage you to continue working with state and local governments on meeting your recreational needs and to submit road-specific comments to us for consideration in future updates to the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of our adaptive management process.
182-1	**Comment***: I would like to comment on the Travel Management Plan alternatives. As a lifelong participant in off road motorcycle activities (40 years), I naturally favor Alternative 1, no further action. The reason for my preference is obvious, but in addition I feel that management of roads and trails by closure is not management at all, except for reasons of damage control, flooding, etc. It results in another freedom lost to federal bureaucracy. What is needed is funding for active management of current resources in addition to future demands for additional trails.* **Response:** The comment and concern is appreciated. Each of the alternatives reflects a compromise between recreational use

	and resource protection. Please also see response to letter 181-3.
182-2	**Comment***: The need for single track motorcycle trails has not been addressed to my knowledge anywhere in the three alternatives. This needs to happen. This type of trail is both easier to create and to maintain by far, and is the vastly preferred way to go to those of us who prefer two wheeled off-road experiences. I also feel that closure of public lands for off road recreation has been going on long enough. As mentioned, management by closure is not management at all. Since sound levels generated by off road vehicles is an issue, sound abatement policies need enforcing. There is no reason for loud off road vehicles.* **Response:** Thank you for your suggestion regarding motorcycle and two track trails. Motorcycles are considered in the EA along with ATVs (motorcycles less than 900 pounds are considered as ATVs). The 2004 Forest Plan does not specifically address single-track trails, but motorcycles are allowed on our ATV trails. The development of additional trails, loops, or connectors would be part of the site-specific project analysis at the Ranger District where the proposal would be located. The 2004 Forest Plan objectives include construction of additional ATV motorized trails. We welcome your participation and input on the future development of trails. The more specific the feedback the better we can accommodate your needs and interests. Please direct your desire to participate to the local District Ranger. Regarding your issue on sound levels of off road vehicles, we do not have authority over sound abatement mechanics of ATVs and motorcycles. State of Wisconsin ATV regulations require ATVs be equipped with a functioning muffler to prevent unusual or excessive noises; sound levels are not to exceed 96 decibels. With sound levels an increasing concern on the Forest with off-road-type vehicles, the purchase of decibel meters is high on the list for enforcement personnel.
182-3	**Comment***: Something else I disagree with is the 30 day time limit imposed for public comment. It is just not enough time to read and understand all the alternatives. As an American citizen and taxpayer I claim the right to comment on anything the federal government does, at any time I choose, and I expect the person to whom I address my comments to at least listen to them and take them into consideration. I refuse to give up my right to comment on this issue after this artificial time constraint.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and desire to thoroughly review the project documents, By regulation (36 CFR 215.6), the comment period on the Environmental Assessment can not be extended beyond the 30 days, which ended August 18, 2009. However, we will consider all comments received prior to making a final decision on the designated network of roads and trails for the first MVUM, which will be published in January 2009. It is important to note that the decision includes an adaptive management process where we will continue to accept comments on a continual basis. This will include accepting roads to evaluate for inclusion or deletion from the MVUM in future annual updates. We want you to know this is an on-going process and that the August 18, 2009, deadline does not mean the Forest will cease taking comments. We are committed to continuing to work collaboratively with all interested parties and encourage people to be as specific as possible when commenting and to recognize the MVUM will be updated annually to incorporate comments received.

182-4	**Comment***: What the Chequamegon-Nicolet NF (and Wisconsin as a whole) needs is to emulate a program similar to the Michigan Cross Country Motorcycle Trail System. This has been a successful system for many years now and is the premier off-road trail system in the US if not the world. If the Forest Service followed that plan there would be no need of any other alternatives. The best alternative already exists in Michigan! Why spend all that taxpayer money on needless studies when the best OHV management program in existence is right next door! As a matter of fact, it would be extremely far sighted and futuristic (and very cool) if CNNF and Michigan joined together and came up with a joint trail system. How awesome would that be! Git-r-done!* **Response:** We appreciate your interest in motorcycles as a means to access the Forest. The MCCMTS crosses National Forest System lands in Michigan, and therefore falls under the Travel Management Rule and many of the laws, regulations, and other requirements followed by this project. We will continue to cooperate with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, counties, and other local governments, in planning motorized recreation opportunities (as do the National Forests in Michigan). Please also note that motorcycles fall within our definition of an ATV and are allowed anywhere an ATV is allowed. Additionally, street legal motorcycles are allowed anywhere a highway legal vehicles are allowed offering motorcycle enthusiasts plenty of access. We encourage you to stat engaged and let us know specifically how we can meet your needs.
183-1	**Comment***: I am writing with my opinion on the closing of the 55% of logging roads in the Nicolet and Chequamegon National forest. In the article it said that ATV's were ruining the roads for hikers, skiers and the environment. If that truly is the case there are laws on the books today that do not allow ATV's to travel on them unless they are designated trails. What needs to be done is to enforce the existing laws not close the roads. If that happens then the only people to use the forest for recreation will be ATV's that break laws and go over berms or around them.* **Response:** Thank you for your concern. Enforcement is difficult because of the vast areas to cover and minimum amount of officers at the present time to do the actual enforcement work. When ATVs are kept to a route and trail system the Forest can actually be managed in a more efficient manner and enforcement areas can be targeted better. We do not agree with the opinion that making roads unavailable for motorize use will result in only illegal ATV use
183-2	**Comment***: The closing of the roads is b*******. I have a cabin near Tipler and spend 7 weeks plus almost all my weekends up there. Never have I saw a hiker or a cross-country skier anywhere "period". This is the West Coast Liberal Tree hugging Wack'Os pushing there Sierra Club agenda, telling us how to manage our forest in our back yard from the other side of the Country. I challenge any one to meet me at my cabin, any time of the year and we will go looking for hikers or skiers. You won't because there's not any to find.* **Response:** Your comment is noted. The Travel Management Rule requires that all decisions are made locally by the Forest. Although some parts of the Forest may have uses that are specific to certain areas, other areas of the Forest are used for non-motorized recreation. As Forest managers, it is our job to balance the need for both motorized and non-motorized recreation.
183-3	**Comment***: What we will see is a lot of forest that is managed for hardwood growth, not recreation as in the President Bush's*

	*executive order. We will also see Bow hunters, grouse hunters, ATV's (on designated routes) ,fly fisher people , bear baiters, bear dogs being ran. We should not close these roads, an example is the road we have gun hunted on for the last 7 years. It's about 1.5 miles back into the woods to where we park. Then another 1/4 - 1/2 mile to our stands. How the hell will we ever get back there for anything. What if we did and shot a deer, how would we get it out. What is wanted is that the forest is untouchable, and that is B*******. The forest is in our State and we should be ashamed to have the wackos tell us what's best for us.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concern. We believe our decision provides for a sustainable and accessible network of roads and trails for motorized use. Please let us know specifically what road this is and we will consider it in our next update to the MVUM. The process of submission of roads for future use is outlined on page 9 of the EA and in Appendix B of the Decision Notice. We encourage your participation in this process which allows for public suggestions to be submitted continually to either add or remove specific roads or trails to the designated network. It is important to us that you be able to continue to use the Forest.
184-1	**Comment***: I got your name from the national forest web site. I hope I am contacting the correct person. We own property (cabin) within the Nicolet National Forest boundaries. We use the cabin primarily for recreation in the form of hunting, snowmobiling and ATV riding. I am concerned of the plan to close more than half of the roads in the Nicolet to motorized vehicles. We use many of those roads, no matter what shape they are in, for the activities mentioned above.* **Response:** In our decision we added approximately 205 additional miles of roads to our travel system, which equates to a 49% reduction of the miles of roads under sole Forest Service jurisdiction. These roads are only part the total miles of roads accessing the Forest. The towns, counties, and the State have jurisdiction over approximately half of the roads accessing the Forest. The 49% of miles of sole Forest Service jurisdiction roads equates to 25% of total miles of roads on the Forest. There will be a total of approximately 6,800 miles of roads under all jurisdictions accessing the Forest. Most of the roads that will be unavailable for motorized use are unauthorized roads, which are not part of the current travel system. Many of these roads are only accessible by high clearance vehicles or not accessible at all. Additionally, the number of miles of ATV trails increased by 16 miles on the west side of the Forest. We encourage your participation in providing input to the MVUM as it is updated each year. The more specific the feedback, the better we can accommodate your needs and interests.
184-2	**Comment***: Please let me know if I am sending my concern to the appropriate party as I want to spread the word and get others to weigh in. I think the plan is not very well publicized and that is why you are not hearing more concerns*. **Response:** Public input was critical to our project. Please see response to comment 181-2 for a description of our public involvement project.
185-1	**Comment***: I'm writing to comment on the proposal of closing motorized access to 55% of the roads & I say Hats Off to You! ATVs are so offending to what used to be the great, peaceful, tranquility of northern Wisconsin woods. Not only are they very noisy and damaging the ecology, you are damaging animal habits, too. Pollution and destruction arises in many forms every time you start one ATV. It doesn't even have to be in the woods. Just riding down Hwy 53 in the past years is just terrible. All the dust*

	that flies in the air & actually hinders driving if you have several of them in a row, due to the wind (or worse, no wind) and volume of dust. I don't want to 'eat their dust' and I do not feel that visitors to Wisconsin view this as appealing, as well (I always have to shut my windows)! It was very disappointing when these vehicles started invading public land. Some people just rip up the ground buzzing around in circles and doing what they call 'joy riding'. I see no joy anywhere in this scenario. What about the public wanting to breathe our fresh air? There is no fresh air around any ATV. Even watching them follow each other, no matter if it is two or more, whoever is riding behind the first one is in a major cloud of dust. That's fun? Let alone the health factors involved in breathing in all that dirt, getting stuff in your eyes, etc. They have to be just filthy when they're done & so are their lungs. **Response:** Thank you for your comment and concern. The Forest Service has identified unmanaged recreation, particularly the unmanaged use of OHVs as one of the four threats facing National Forests and Grasslands today. OHVs are a legitimate use of the National Forest System; however, this use should be managed carefully to ensure protection of other resources such as impacts to soil, water, wildlife habitat, and other recreational visitors. The intent of the proposed changes in OHV management on National Forests is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. These changes also allow for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. The Travel Management Rule requires each National Forest to designate roads, trails, and areas that are open to public motor vehicle use. The process of identification of roads that meet these needs is outlined in this project's Environmental Assessment (EA), and results in a road system that is (1) safe and responsive to public needs and desires, (2) affordable and efficiently managed, (3) has minimal negative ecological effect on the land, and (4) is in balance with available funding for needed management actions. Many people like yourself expressed an opinion in clear support of, or opposition to, one of the alternatives considered in the EA. Each alternative reflects a compromise between recreational use and resource protection. We read each of your comments and took them into consideration in our decision. We believe the selection of Alternative 3 (as modified) best meets your needs by providing a network of roads and trails that is accessible and sustainable. We believe this alternative better addresses the need for access than Alternative2, because it provides more opportunities for access where access can be sustained. It also allows for increased access during the fall hunting season while balancing the need for non-motorized use. Choosing Alternative 1 at this time would be irresponsible. If we choose to do nothing and allow the current motor vehicle use to occur unmanaged, we believe that your enjoyment of the National Forest will decrease while the environmental impacts would likely increase. Designating roads for motorized use without site-specific information and validation may have unintended consequences. Alternative 3 (as modified) provides a more appropriate process for reviewing and designating additional roads not yet considered (unauthorized roads). Putting all the unauthorized roads that have not been evaluated onsite on the map may lead to increased environmental damage that in some cases could be irreversible. Please see the Decision Notice for a full description of our decision and rationale. The use of the adaptive management process will allow us to continue to evaluate unauthorized roads that have not yet been brought to our attention or to address other areas of concern. We encourage you to continue working with state and local governments on meeting your recreational needs and to submit road-specific comments to us for consideration in future updates to the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of our adaptive

	management process.
185-2	**Comment***: In a day & age when it is human behavior & greed that is destroying our Earth, we need to be thinking very wisely and adjusting drastically to help save our Earth! It is absolutely necessary that action be happening everyday to help reverse the disastrous state this whole world is in. In Wisconsin, we all need to be thinking GREEN! It is so sad that it is taking so long for peoples eyes to be opened to what really matters and counts. It's known as common sense when you act to preserve our natural resources & this is greatly needed for everyone's future. Have you ever seen the 1970s movie 'Soilent Green'? Since I've seen that movie in the 70s, I've witnessed that exact form taking shape in our world. Everything living, except for humans, has become extinct. You have to go to a green house, just to see trees & foliage. Animals aren't around at all. Today, everyday you read or hear that now this species is going to be extinct, they have been either eaten out of existence by human consumption or there aren't enough favorable habitats for them to exist anymore how scary is that! We have huge gardens in our yard & if I saw two bees in the past week, that was a lot. There is another very scary fact: just ask the scientist who are studying it. It was never like this before. I just had a 92 yr. old woman express her major concern of what is happening in our world today, I'm sure you have heard your stories from the elders***.** **Response:** Thank you for sharing your perspective. As land managers, we take our Agency's mission very seriously, especially when it pertains to sustaining the health, diversity, and productivity of this Forest to meet the needs of present and future generations. Please see response to comment 201-2 for a discussion on the Forest Service mission.
185-3	**Comment***: Get the ATVs out of our protected lands & get that noise pollution out of our woods. If hunters are complaining about having to hoof it & they are not in shape. Do yourself a favor & get back in shape for your own health & the lands health. All of the obese & lazy people who want the world to just conform to their eating desire/disease that is not right at all!! We are all paying for that in health insurance premiums. Get out & walk, do the world a favor. Coddling is not the answer.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Please see response to 185-1 above.
185-4	**Comment***: Please act accordingly ASAP. The DNR & Federal Government Agencies need to be moving at the speed of light to help save all of the lands & return back to nature what needs to be there. Do not let someone's own personal greed detour the safety of land & animal life. Animals, birds and bugs cannot speak for themselves; they will just disappear, potentially never to be found again. How do they say it Get Back to Nature! Please!!* **Response:** We believe our decision provides a balance between motorized and non motorized recreation while minimizing the environmental impact.
186-1	**Comment***: I would like to thank you for the conversation we had this morning regarding the new Travel Management Rule. I am sending you this e-mail because I know you will pass it on to the right people that have the power to implement positive change. Positive change that supports "OUR" environment and that supports the public sportsman, which I am one of. I've attended the Crandon meeting and spoke to a lot of Forestry people and sent several letters detailing the publics concerns. To date I have not been at all satisfied with the results, until I spoke to you! You spoke to me with respect and explained the program in a way that I*

	could understand it and I thank you for that Rich!" **Response:** Thank you for your interest and input into the alternatives. We encourage the public to contact us with any questions about this project or any other projects on the Forest.
186-2	**Comment***: I know I individually can't change what I would like to see and that is the system to stay as it is. Since I can't change it, maybe I can at the very least have an impact to enhance the three Alternatives noted in the Environmental Assessment. If I understand the Environmental Assessment properly, it appears that Alternative #1 is basically no change. Based on what I was told, this probably won't be an option. Alternative #2 and #3 have very limited access to the areas I am use to traveling i.e. hunting, fishing and trapping areas. I was told several times to submit my request of roads I would like to continue to stay open. I did not do this for one reason. That being, if a road opens for public travel, it will be just that and be traveled to the point of heavy use. That is not what I want or I believe the Forestry wants. That will only make the current situation, which I feel is working, much worse. So here is my proposal and I pray that you honor it.* **Response:** Thank you for your interest and input into the alternatives related to this project. Please see response to comment 181-3. We still encourage you to let us know specifically what roads are important to you. That is the best way for us to meet your needs and interest.
186-3	**Comment***: Allow Alternative #1 during the Fall hunting season. From the beginning of bow hunting season to the end of bow hunting season. This season covers the small game and big game hunting season. Outside of this period I would suggest going to Alternative #2 or #3. Either one would be sufficient outside of this season. If applicable, I would also like to see Alternative #1 stay open through the month of March to support the trapping season. I suggest this because there would be zero damage under frozen conditions and would allow trappers like myself to get back to their favorite trapping areas. One other point, the above proposal would also support wood cutting and during the season when wood cutting is should to be done. This proposal will satisfy I believe the best of both worlds i.e. the public interest and the Forestry. It would also reduce the amount of heavy use on the very limited roads / fire lanes that are noted in Alternative #2 and #3.* **Response:** Thank you for your suggestions. The decision designates a network of road and trails that will be available for public motorized vehicle use on the Forest. The decision will encompass a fall access season from Sep 1 to Dec 31. Initially, the network will include approximately 6,800 total miles of road under all jurisdictions as available for public motor vehicle use. 2,363 of these miles are under sole Forest Service jurisdiction. The decision also designated 334 miles of trails for public ATV use. We feel that this decision as modified best meets the needs of the public based on the information we currently have available to us by providing a network of roads and trails that is accessible and sustainable. The use of the adaptive management process will allow us to continue to evaluate unauthorized roads that have not yet been brought to our attention or to address other areas of concern. Please let us know specifically which roads are important to your use of the Forest. This decision better addresses the need for access than Alternative 2, because it provides more opportunities for access where it can be sustained and allows for increased access during the fall hunting season. We do not agree that allowing motorized use during the month of March would result in "zero damage" (see Soils, Hydrology and Wildlife reports).

186-4	**Comment***: I could probably write a book as to why this is important to me personally and the general public, but I have voiced my concern many times in the past. I hope my voice will be heard and action is taken to work together. I am really trying to work through this unlike a lot of other people among the public. I have told many people about this and for the most part they either did not believe me that it really is going to happen or they will wait until it does happen and then make more noise than a 4th of July Firework show. I also believe that you are receiving limited response from the public because most of the people affected are from the Valley and further South and simply are not aware of these changes. So please, believe me that I am speaking for many sportsman and I am confident that they would support the above proposal.* **Response:** Access to the Forest is very near and dear to many folks in the area and we appreciate you taking the time to submit your comments to this project. With respect to public involvement associated with this project, please see response to comment 181-2. Again, please stay engaged as we work through the MVUM update process in the years to come.
187-1	**Comment***: I've been following this debate over national forest road closings both in Upper Peninsula of Michigan and now Wisconsin. I am so sick of hearing the phrase non-motorized experience? I could just puke. For Pete's sake, once again we are going to change the experience that hunters and woods enthusiasts have been doing for years, and also while I might add paying tons of revenue through licenses fees and just money in general to support local and state economies. Give me some concrete reason as to why this change is necessary. If you are going to tell me that you can't maintain all the roads, let me suggest that you don't have to, hunters and avid woodsmen will take care of it for you.* **Response:** We recognize the Forest is used by many people for various outdoor experiences including those where motorized vehicles are not allowed. Please see comment 181-3 for reasons why the Forest is implementing this change.
187-2	**Comment***: Wolves don't get me started about wolf pack effects what about declining deer populations from the wolf pack effects. Shutdown over 1500 miles of roads because some of them come within a mile of elk calving areas, are you kidding me?* **Response:** While one of the outcomes of this project would be a reduction in the number of miles of open roads within wolf pack territories, it is not one of the purposes of this project. See also the response to comment 439-3 concerning elk, and the response to comment 355-2 concerning deer.
187-3	**Comment***: Here is my suggestion to the offenders of national forests, setup a program where hunters and avid woodsman can call a 800 number to expose offenders and you will go a long way to gaining hunting enthusiasts confidence and continue to make us all good stewards of what the good Lord gave us to use and as a caretaker.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Please contact the local Forest Service Law Enforcement Officer at your local District Ranger Office to report violations or to discuss your law enforcement concerns.
187-4	**Comment***: Another suggestion, whenever tracks of forest are harvested, let the taxpayer pay for the roads to be installed, not the logger. Unless you will leave them open since they didn't cost the taxpayer a single red cent to build. I've used these roads all my life to enjoy recreational use, just taking a road trip to see a ruffed grouse or take a deer.*

	Response: Roads on our Forests that are used during timber harvest are paid for through timber dollars obtained through the timber sale receipts, or are constructed by Forest Service personnel. Decisions on whether the roads used during a timber sale are to remain open, closed, or decommissioned, depending on future needs, is a District Ranger decision.
187-5	**Comment***: After some of the lands are cleared, carve out some 40 acre parcels and plant food plots for deer management; you would see the deer population improve as the deer would move out of the urban areas and back into the woods where they belong.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; however, vegetation management such as this is outside of the scope of this project.
187-6	**Comment***: Sorry for the venting, however, closing these roads in the Nicolet and Chequamegon forests is just plain WRONG.* **Response:** We appreciate all comments related to this project. The Travel Management Rule that is implemented with this project on the Forest requires each National Forest designate roads, trails, and areas that are open to public motor vehicle use. The Forest Service is responding to the growing motorized vehicle use demand on its roads and trails. National Forests are used by the public for multiple purposes and when properly managed, OHV use is a legitimate use of National Forest System lands. The intent of the proposed changes in OHV management is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. These changes also allow for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. Also, please see comment 181-3 for additional reasons why we are implementing this change.
188-1	**Comment***: I am opposed to your proposed 55% reduction of motorized access to forest roads. The articles I have read on the subject offer no evidence of large scale, permanent environmental damage. This is a restriction on those who use and support the National parks for recreation. This is just part of a movement against any motorized vehicles which for the most part is supported by those who don't use the parks anyways but want to dictate to others what they can do. The area is large enough to accommodate all types of uses and the road mileage should be left unchanged.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; however, scientific evidence is available describing environmental damage within Wisconsin and nationally due to motorized recreation use (see Recreation report). Additionally, National Park lands are managed under different agency mission and goals than the Forest Service. Please also see comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are implementing this project.
189-1	**Comment***: Road closure issues should be based on what is best for managing and protecting the integrity and quality of the ecological ecosystems systems within and adjacent to the access roads/trails. Closure should consider: 1. Timber management, access needed to manage the trees, 2. Water management, rutting of soils and siltation into the water shed, 3. Soil management, rutting and compaction, cost and ease of maintenance, 4. Vegetation management, destruction of plants, 5. Air quality, dust and emission management, 6. Wildlife, providing animals the necessary space to survive as well as providing access to manage them, 7. Recreation/subsistence, hunting, sight seeing, motorized and non motorized access, cutting firewood. Management to a large extent is good and we as a people need it to survive. Without protection of the ecological*

	systems we as a species will not survive and at a minimum our quality of life will decline. **Response:** We agree. Please see the Road Analysis Process (RAP) report for this project. This report describes the process of designating motorized use on roads and trails.
189-2	**Comment***: Minimum motorized access is best. I support the original proposals.* **Response:** Others expressed the same opinion. Please see response to comment 185-1.
190-1	**Comment***: I saw the Milwaukee Journal front page news today and wish to express my deep concerns over the closure of logging roads. Where do I need to go to let the proper people know how wrong they are for doing this and discuss my feelings? I've been going up north hunting for 40 years and this will be a show stopper if it's true. People need access to the forest and I can tell you the ecosystem is fine. It's the logging trucks you need to worry about.* **Response:** We appreciate your comment. Others reacted the same way to this information it the media. Please see comment 184-1. For further information related to our decision on this project, see response to letter 181-3. We encourage your continued participation in providing input to the MVUM as it is updated each year. The more specific the feedback the better we can accommodate your needs and interests.
191-1	**Comment***: I want to share the following comments about the proposal. On the whole, I feel that Alternatives 2 and 3 are thoughtful and appropriate. They demonstrate proper attention to the key goals of forest conservation: maintaining the quality of the environment, maintaining user access, and planning to keep the resources and experiences available for future generations.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Others expressed similar comments. Please see response to comment 185-1.
191-2	**Comment***: As a landowner in the Chute Lake area, whose land is bordered on two sides by Forest Service land, I am satisfied both with the proposals as a whole, and with the proposals as they affect my vicinity. I approve of the decision to limit access to road 2071A based on your assessment of risks.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We appreciate your input and review of the roads specific to your needs. Please feel free to contact the Forest if there are additions or deletions you would like considered in the annual MVUM update. The process is outlined in Appendix B of the Decision Notice.
191-3	**Comment***: I would be happy to see either Alternative 2 or 3 approved. But I also hope you will pay reasonable attention to feedback, and accept small modifications. Roads of concern which need more protection, as well as roads with extensive use which might require more motorized access, should be considered. However, I would ask you not to alter the plan too dramatically. I think these existing plans strike a proper balance between motorized use and other uses; were a different plan to be implemented which added/maintained too many miles of ATV use, it would be less effective at balancing the multiple uses. In the end, I believe Alternative 3 would be the best choice, since it addresses concerns about lack of access, making a useful move*

	toward compromise **Response:** Thank you taking the time to review our alternatives. We considered all the comments received during the public comment period. Based on the road specific comments we received, we added 205 miles of roads and 16 miles of trails to the forest transportation system. Please see the Decision Notice for a full explanation of our decision and rationale.
191-4	**Comment***: Over the decades I've grown familiar with snowmobile use in the Chute Lake area, and I understand how it is a familiar part of the local culture, and the culture of northern Wisconsin as a whole. I am less comfortable with growing ATV use, and believe that needs to be managed carefully. I agree with Dale Bosworth that unmanaged ORV use is a major threat to the forests. Snowmobile trails have been developed through impressive community efforts over the course of decades, and are only intended to be used when people are usually indoors, and the ground is frozen. The Forest Service should limit use of snowmobile roads, particularly when there are local objections, for ATV use.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Snowmobile use is not a part of the Travel Management Project. This project only affects wheeled motorized vehicles.
191-5	**Comment**: *I believe that limiting motorized road use is an important goal. Roadless areas are a valuable part of our national heritage, and environment. Particularly as gas prices rise, increasing spending on roads is not an effective choice. Too many roads have already been built through the national forests. From what I've seen, the Forest Service has done a thoughtful job identifying areas where road use would be too damaging, and provide little benefit, particularly in limiting access to roads that pass through wetlands.* **Response:** Thank you for your input and perspective.
193-1	**Comment***: My reading of the proposal indicates FS failed to evaluate all roads presently earth bermed or gated to determine which ones should be re-opened for vehicle travel.* **Response:** You are correct, we did not re-evaluate any existing closed roads; these roads were closed based on a previous site-specific project analysis and decision. The Travel Management Rule does not require the Forest Service to reconsider any previous decisions that allow, restrict, or prohibit motorized use. The Travel Management Rule includes a paragraph in 212.50 to clarify that these previous decisions may be incorporated into decisions made under this rule.
193-2	**Comment**: *FS have failed to consider the aging baby boomer population and their growing need for vehicle transportation for those with present mobility impairments or those that will experience future mobility problems in direct conflict with the Americans with Disabilities Act.* **Response:** Thank you for your concern. We welcome people with all abilities to the Forest. Please see response to comment 180-1.

193-3	**Comment***: FS has failed to recognize the Presidential Executive Order of August 17, 2007, entitled "Facilitation of Hunting Heritage and Wildlife Conservation." Specifically, this Order states "that Federal agencies shall ..": Closing these woods roads also limits the ability of FS to "enhance wildlife management" as identified in the Presidential Order cited above. In summary. FS is proposing action in direct contradiction to the Presidential Order of August 17, 2007. As such, FS needs to STOP any further efforts to implement the proposed travel management project* **Response:** Thank you for your input. Please see the Roads Analysis Process report in the EA for an extensive description of the resource risk and value issues used in road designation decisions. Wildlife habitat and conservation is considered as required under the Executive Order. Please also see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are implementing this project. We believe our decision provides a balance between motorized and non motorized recreation while minimizing environmental impacts. The Forest remains accessible to hunting.
193-4	**Comment***: I am against any action by the Forest Service at this time for the following reasons: 1. Evaluate the effect of agency actions on trends in hunting participation and, where appropriate to address declining trends, implement actions that expand and enhance hunting opportunities for the public. Wisconsin has demonstrated declining trends in deer hunting by rifle as evidenced by declining gun-deer license sales. Wisconsin has demonstrated declining trends in waterfowl hunting.* **Response:** We understand that a reduction in available roads is one of many factors that can influence hunter success (for deer, bear, grouse, or turkey). However, our decision does not affect the hunting opportunity on the CNNF – our decision may change the means of transportation from a motor vehicle to foot or bicycle, but not the ability to access the forest. Thus, our decision does not affect hunting availability on the forest, but rather the means to access hunting opportunities on the forest. With the exception of campgrounds and administrative sites, the vast majority of the CNNF will continue to be open to hunters that prefer to use motor vehicles and those who prefer a “walk-in experience.” We believe that our decision complies with Executive Order 13443 to enhance hunting opportunities because we are responding appropriately to all hunting interests. Finally, if there are roads that are not on the MVUM, people will continue to have opportunities to submit suggestions to us to add those roads for a map update. Regarding hunting participation declines in the State, this is affected by many complex factors beyond road access to the national forest: • aging population • lack of private land access • cost • urbanizing population • loss of habitat to urbanization • abundance of other youth activities • lack of available mentors

	While road access is a contributing factor, our decision of designating 2,363 miles of roads contributes to an overall network of 6,800 miles of road when you account for all jurisdictions (township, county, State, and federal). Plus, we are increasing the number of ATV trail miles with this decision (334 miles). We believe this provides ample access for people so they enjoy the outdoors on the national forest while also addressing the environmental impacts that arise from this use.
193-5	**Comment:** *I am against any action by the Forest Service at this time because the current woods roads that user of the National Forest access is for a variety of outdoor recreational activities. These include wild berry picking, access to remote sections of trout streams, access to remote pot hole lakes for waterfowl hunting, access to areas for trapping, for deer hunting and bear hunting (especially bear hunting with hounds), for coyote and bobcat hunting.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing these recreational activities. We believe our decision provides adequate access for these activities. Our decision provides for a balance between motorized and non-motorized experience. If there are particular roads you use for your recreation on the Forest, please let us know. The more specific you can be, the better we can address your needs. Please also see also response to comment 187-6 for an explanation of why we are implementing this project.
193-6	**Comment:** *These woods roads are not maintained by FS and therefore don't cost the U.S. taxpayer one penny; the users maintain the access.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We have not presented lack of maintenance funding as a rationale on this project for eliminating use on any road. The factors used to evaluate roads in this project are the resource risks of water quality; soils; heritage resources; threatened, endangered and sensitive species habitats; and the potential to spread invasive species. Other factors used to evaluate roads are the values of recreation, private access and administrative access. Please see the Roads Analysis Process (RAP) Report for a more detailed discussion. Most of the roads that are not included for public motorized use are low standard roads. We acknowledge that we typically do not spend maintenance funding on low standard roads. Maintenance funding is focused on higher standard roads.
194-1	**Comment:** *You have done an excellent job in the environmental assessment of the CNNF Travel Management Project. After reviewing the three alternatives, I strongly support the Forest Proposal - Alternative 2. I have no other comments at this time.* **Response:** Thank you for your review of our proposal and input to our decision. The Forest decision was to accept Alternative 3 as modified. When compared to Alternative 2 we felt that is best meets the needs based on the information we currently have available to us by providing a network of roads and trails that is accessible and sustainable, and allows for increased access during the fall hunting season.
195-1	**Comment:** *I have read the article in the Vilas County News Review, July 16, 2008, and agree fully with the potential decision of the Forestry Service to close the roads in question. I think it would be even better if you could keep ATVs out of the forest altogether. But since that is not the issue, I think closure of the unauthorized roads is a good idea. The News Review mentions that "the major closures of the unauthorized roads involve those that run within wolf pack territories.., those within 1/4 mile of elk calving areas.., those within100' of non-native invasive species.., and roads in high risk soils". Again, I support the closure of*

	these roads. **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Others expressed the same comment. Please see response to comment 185-1.
196-1	**Comment**: *I recently read an article regarding a proposed plan to close nearly have of the forest roads within the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest. Without knowing any specifics it is difficult for me to make any definitive statement on this issue. However, the idea of closing off public access to public lands or restricting access to public lands is very troubling. This forest belongs to the public and every effort must be made to ensure that all taxpaying Americans who desire to utilize this resource can do so.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. When created, management of the Chequamegon and Nicolet National Forests was based on the Weeks Act (March 1, 1911) as amended by the Clarke-McNary Act (June 7, 1924). The Weeks Act authorized Congress to appropriate funds to acquire lands for "the conservation land improvement of the navigability of a river," and it focused on the lands containing the headwaters of such rivers. The Clarke-McNary Act broadened the purpose for purchase of lands for Forest Reserves by authorizing purchase of "such forested, cut-over, or denuded land within the watersheds of navigable streams as may be necessary to the regulation of the flow of navigable streams or for the production of timber." Since that time Congress has passed a body of laws that requires a broader natural resource focus when it comes to the management of national forest lands. Laws such as the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960, the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, and the National Forest Management Act of 1976 are examples of laws that apply to these lands and require consideration of a broader array of resource issues and public values than did the two acts under which the Forests were originally established. The decision on this project falls within the 2004 Forest Plan goals associated with the body of laws directing management of national forest lands, including the Weeks Act and the Clarke-McNary Act. Additionally, the mission of the Forest Service is to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the Nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations. As set forth in law, the mission is to achieve quality land management under the sustainable multiple-use management concept to meet the diverse needs of people. For more information related to Forest Service Mission, Motto, Vision, and Guiding Principles see: http://www.fs.fed.us/aboutus/mission.shtml. Also, please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation as to why we are implementing this project.
197-1	**Comment:** *Road closure is the single best thing you can do to protect the area and to enhance the experience of using it. I can't begin to tell you how many times the peace and tranquility I've found up there has been shattered by the whine of four-wheel ATVs. And it used to be that our truly remote and wild places could only be visited by folks willing to put in the effort to reach them -- fitting, because the difficulty of reaching them kept them wild. Now it seems that anyone with a couple thousand dollars and gasoline to burn can run anywhere. It has spoiled much of the forest for those of us who need to experience the wild places in*

	their natural state and without the noise if engines and smell of burned gasoline **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 187-6 for why we are implementing this project.
197-2	**Comment:** *You will hear many arguments about how the closure proposal shuts of access to disabled people. It's really just a matter of degree, isn't it? By my reading of the article, we'll still have over 2,000 miles of roads accessible by motorized vehicle. That's not shutting off access to anyone. But it is preserving access to special places by people willing to invest the time and energy to reach them*. **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We believe our decision provides for a balance between motorized and non motorized use. It also provides plenty of access for everyone regardless of ability. Also see response to comment 180-1 regarding persons with disabilities.
197-3	**Comment:** *Please be assured that many, many outdoors enthusiasts -- myself among them -- support your plan for closure. And thanks for everything you're trying to do with this proposal* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. Please see response to comment 185-1. Others expressed similar opinions..
198-1	**Comment:** *First off I would like to say that if I had not read the article in the Eau Claire Leader Telegram I would not have known about this issue. A lot of people do not read the newspaper. An issue like this should be aired on the radio to reach more people. In the radio ad there should be a web address and contact (e-mail address) that people from all over the state could comment and give their opinions. This issue is not only for the locals, but for all residents in Wisconsin to voice their comments to those who are heading this project. Even the article I read did not give a web address, contact e-mail address, or phone numbers for those people who collect the comments. In my opinion, this issue should be made more aware to the people of the whole state and more time to comment on this issue. I believe that more people would comment on this issue if people were aware of it*. **Response:** We appreciate you concern about public involvement. It is very important to us as well. Please see response to comment 181-2 for an explanation of our public involvement process.
198-2	**Comment:** *I am a disabled vet that enjoys deer hunting. I am able to get around but what about those people who have bad backs or other medical problems that hinder them from dragging a deer out of the forest? Their conditions may be bad enough that they can't haul a deer from the woods but not bad enough to get a medical grant to use ATV's or other vehicles. Closing nearly 55 percent of the roads would greatly limit people like myself and others to enjoy the remote areas of the forest. Why do we always worry about the bikers, skiers and hikers? They must be physically able to do these types of activities or they wouldn't be doing them. This should not be an issue that should bother them. Bikers have bikes to handle this terrain, hikers hike through the forest, not the roads, and skiers ski when the ground is frozen and covered with snow* **Response:** We appreciate your input and encourage everyone to enjoy National Forest lands. Please see response to comment 180-1.

198-3	**Comment:** *In the article it stated "Many of the roads to be closed get relatively little use and have not been maintained. They have vegetation poking through them and require a four-wheel drive." This says to me that they do get some use otherwise they would be over grown with vegetation. And if they are not being maintained, it's not costing any more money to keep them open*. **Response:** We acknowledge the condition of roads vary greatly from open and drivable to overgrown and not drivable. However, whether or not a road is being used or the level to which a road is being used is only one factor in determining whether or not to designate motorized use. Cost is not the determining factor. The factors used to evaluate roads in this project are the resource risks of water quality; soils; heritage resources; threatened, endangered and sensitive species habitats; and the potential to spread invasive species. Other factors used to evaluate roads are the values of recreation, private access and administrative access. Please see the Roads Analysis Process (RAP) Report for a more detailed discussion.
198-4	**Comment:** *In short keep the roads open for all to enjoy all areas of the forest* **Response:** Others expressed similar comments. Please see response to comment 181-3.
199-1	**Comment:** *My key interest in the Travel Management Project is to ensure that Forest Roads 15-55, 15-54 and 1560 in the Medford district (northern Taylor County) are closed for regular ATV use. I use this area of the Forest for outdoor recreation (hunting, hiking, fishing - Jump River) and have been disappointed in the past by ATV rutting of these trails making it difficult for passage by foot. In reviewing the three alternatives, all keep these sensitive trials closed to ATV use and therefore all alternatives are acceptable from my viewpoint.* **Response:** Thank you for your road specific comment. 1554 and 1555 will be unavailable to all motorized use and 1560 will be available to highway legal vehicle use only
200-1	**Comment:** *I support project Alternative 2; it provides the greatest reduction in motorized use, especially in known timer wolf habitat and does very little to reduce commercial timber harvesting operations* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and review of the EA. Our decision was to accept Alternative 3 as modified. When compared to Alternative 2 we felt that is best meets the needs based on the information we currently have available to us by providing a network of roads and trails that is accessible and sustainable, and allows for increased access during the fall hunting season. Please see the Decision Notice for a thorough explanation of our decision and our rationale
201-1	**Comment:** *This comment concerns the three alternatives for the National Forest Travel Management Project. I am in favor of the Forest Service Preferred Plan (Alternative 2) because it appears to decrease the overall road mileage in the forest. Most of that mileage is unneeded because it was originally constructed for logging. There is no need to spend money on the upkeep of roads that will only be used once every 50-100 years and, in my view, should never again be used for logging. Access will still be readily available for multiple uses* **Response:** Thank you for taking the time to review the EA and submit a comment. The decision on this project is a modified Alternative 3. We believe our decision provides for a balance between access and resource protection. We believe it provides

	adequate access for everyone.
201-2	**Comment:** *I am concerned, though, that ATV use will not be significantly otherwise restricted. I agree with Mr. Bosworth that ATVs can be significantly destructive to the forest and its wildlife, but disagree that ATVs are sometimes OK; they should never be allowed in what otherwise should be federally-designated wilderness. Yes, this forest is not a wilderness, but could be and used to be* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. The mission of the Forest Service is to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the Nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations. As set forth in law, the mission is to achieve quality land management under the sustainable multiple-use management concept to meet the diverse needs of people. For more information related to Forest Service Mission, Motto, Vision, and Guiding Principles see: http://www.fs.fed.us/aboutus/mission.shtml. Also please see response to comment 185-1.
201-3	**Comment:** *ATVs are inappropriate in national forests because There are many, many miles of trails available on private land. Federal land should be pristinely preserved* **Response:** To fulfill the Forest service mission-based responsibilities to protect the environment and provide balanced use of the lands, certain recreation uses are allowed, restricted, or prohibited in some areas of Forest Service land. ATVs are a legitimate vehicle to be used on the National Forest; however this process establishes a designated route system for their use. Off trail, off road use is not permitted.
201-4	**Comment:** *ATVs are inappropriate in national forests because they are destructive to the land, causing erosion* **Response:** Please see response to comment 201-3; additional information related to resource considerations can be found in the EA, RAP, and specialists reports.
201-5	**Comment:** *ATVs are inappropriate in national forests because they disturb animals, causing them to use energy to escape and decreasing their range in their attempt to avoid human contact*. **Response:** ATVs are permitted on a designated route system. Although there may be some effects to animals those effects have been factored in to the analysis and assessment documented in the EA.
201-6	**Comment:** *ATVs are inappropriate in national forests because they make access too easy to areas of endangered species, creating the possibility of making them more endangered or extinct.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 201-4. We also encourage you to read the Decision Notice.
201-7	**Comment:** *ATVs are inappropriate in national forests because they readily spread invasive species* **Response:** Please see response to comment 201-4.

201-8	**Comment:** *ATVs are inappropriate in national forests because their noise is disturbing to not only the animals, but those people who love the sounds of nature instead of the engines of man*. **Response:** The decision for this project provides a balance of motorized and non-motorized access. There are many areas on the forest where motorized use is not permitted and provide for quiet solitude.
201-9	**Comment:** *ATVs are inappropriate in national forests because they pollute the air and land, decrease the appropriately used supply of oil and add to global warming* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concerns; however, we are unaware of scientific evidence linking ATV use to global warming.
201-10	**Comment:** *ATVs are inappropriate in national forests because they are simply a means of thrilling recreation, inappropriate for a forest; riders can go to Six Flags Great America or a dirt bike course for the same thrills.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 201-2.
201-11	**Comment:** *ATVs are inappropriate in national forests because to Native Americans, this land is sacred and should be cared for; there is no spiritual value in ATV destruction.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concern.
201-12	**Comment:** *ATVs are inappropriate in national forests because ATV riders still would have as great an access to the forest as anyone. Let them get more exercise and use their feet like others who truly love nature.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; also please see responses to comments 201-2 and 187-6.
201-13	**Comment:** *Please decrease the miles available to ATVs in the National Forests* **Response:** In the development of the 2004 Forest Plan was identified as a legitimate use on the CNNF. The scope of that use is defined in the plan. This decision for this project is consistent with the Forest Plan.
202-1	**Comment:** *We travel several times per year (one summer and one fall trip) to northern Wisconsin with a group (usually 10 ATV's), We try new areas each time. We are older adults (probably average 60 yrs old each) & pride ourselves at moving slowly, safely, not causing damage or problems. We stay in lodging facilities, eat all of our meals at restaurants/supper clubs, buy stuff in all the communities we are near (clothing, parts & supplies , gas etc) We keep track of our expenses, and we spend about $1,000 per person, per trip. We especially enjoy being off the main ATV trails just "poking around" on the other trails. By reducing total miles of your trails, we need to be looking to other areas where they are expanding their tourism by encouraging more trails. By utilizing these off-road areas, are we really destroying the environment* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and description of your travels to the Forest. In our decision we increase ATV access

	by 71 miles of roads and 18 miles of ATV trails. Please also see response to comment 185-1.
202-2	**Comment:** *We never see people just out walking back in the boonies it's all in their preservationist minds. Obviously not in favor of the reductions you are proposing* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 181-3.
203-1	**Comment***: I just want to provide my view on your proposal to close roads within the national forest. I would like to see the amount of motorized access limited. I've looked at the maps, but do not have a preference for Alternative 2 or 3. This would be a step in the right direction for the environment, my overall experience, and possibly the Forest Service's maintenance budget. As a hunter, I like the "big woods" experience. That's difficult to enjoy when you walk across a road every quarter to half mile, and have trucks driving everywhere.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your perspective. The decision encompasses Alternative 3, as describe in the EA, with modifications to add of 205 miles of road for motorized use. . The decision also designated 334 miles of trail to be available for public ATV use. We encourage your participation in the annual update of the MVUM, please see response to comment 183-3 for the process to submit specific roads for closure or opening in the future.
204-1	**Comment:** *I have received and reviewed the Forest Services proposed travel management plan. As a landowner of property that adjoins the National Forest, and a user of the Forest, I was disappointed with the proposal.* **Response:** We appreciate all comments related to this project. The Travel Management Rule that is implemented with this project on the Forest requires each National Forest designate roads, trails, and areas that are open to public motor vehicle use. The Forest Service is responding to the growing motorized vehicle use demand on its roads and trails. National Forests are used by the public for multiple purposes and when properly managed, OHV use is a legitimate use of National Forest System lands. The intent of the proposed changes in OHV management is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. These changes also allow for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation.
204-2	**Comment:** *I had previously provided my input to the plan and was in support of allowing the use of Forest roads by ATV's. I encourage the Forest Service to close a good portion of the road that are open to licensed motor vehicles, as the road density in the Forest is too great. For the remaining roads, I see no sound justification for not allowing multiple use both licensed vehicles and ATV's. If I can legally access these areas with my Jeep, why can't I access the same area with my ATV? My property is located in the Town of Townsend in Oconto County, and the Township last year opened up town roads as ATV roads. From my perspective this has worked well and is an example of how sharing access to this type of roadway can work* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concerns. We believe the decision provides a balance of both motorized and non-motorized use. We understand your concerns and interest with being able to drive either an ATV or HLV. There are some roads that are open to both uses however it is not expected this will occur on very many roads within your area.

205-1	**Comment:** *I am in support of the proposal to reduce motorized access to the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest. Motorized vehicles have a heavy impact on the environment, and it is important to protect our wild places. Under the proposal, people who wish to ride around on motorized vehicles will still be able to use some of the roads. At least this proposal limits the noise, pollution and destruction wrought by motorized vehicles. It is a compromise*. **Response:** Thank you for sharing your perspective.
205-2	**Comment***: In the future, I hope the Forest Service enacts even stricter restrictions on the use of motorized vehicles* **Response:** Presently, the Travel Management Rule is the Forest Service's response to the growing motorized vehicle use demand on its road and trails. The implementation of the rule with this project will allow us to add or delete roads through public input into the MVUM update process.
205-3	**Comment:** *Please remember that some of us live quite far from the forest, but we value it just the same. Knowing that the forest is intact, sheltering the plants and animals that belong there, free from our intrusion is important to us as riding ATVs is to others. It is a low impact "use" of the forest, but just as valid. Also, have you asked the plants, animals, rocks, air, water and soil about their opinion* **Response:** We believe this decision provides a balance of both motorized and non-motorized access and ensures the sustainability of the resources we are entrusted with managing..
206-1	**Comment:** *Please do not take away our existing roads with the potential of truly spreading exotics and calving area roads at birthing times. If you do not want to maintain these roads let sportsmen, clubs, ATV riders and snowmobilers keep them open* **Response:** Although there will be some changes to access to protect resources during certain critical periods or to prevent the spread of invasive species, you will not likely see a dramatic change to the access you currently have. We always appreciate those who are interested in assisting the maintenance of their National Forest.
207-1	**Comment:** *I agree with alternative 2 because of its focus on the far more important biological issues facing the National Forest. Managing forest resources first for their highest biological values always supercedes recreational desires of special interest groups, whether they be ATVers, kayakers, or any other subgroup of users. Alternative 2 appears to pay the most attention to the extreme threat of invasive species, as well as to soil erosion, stream clarity, and to threatened and endangered resources that could be impacted. Please always choose first to protect and enhance the many natural forest communities, and always secondarily choose to support the many diverse uses humans may subject the forest to. While I am in full support of the forest industry and various "consumptive" uses, these must always be managed with the highest biological principles foremost in mind.* **Response:** We appreciate all comments related to this project. The Travel Management Rule that is implemented with this project on the Forest requires each National Forest designate roads, trails, and areas that are open to public motor vehicle use. The Forest Service is responding to the growing motorized vehicle use demand on its roads and trails. National Forests are used

	by the public for multiple purposes and when properly managed, OHV use is a legitimate use of National Forest System lands. The intent of the proposed changes in OHV management is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. These changes also allow for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. Also, please see comment 185-1 for additional reasons why we are implementing this change.
208-1	**Comment:** *I really feel to save road maint costs on the NF the number of miles of open road need to be significantly reduced - this should have been analyzed and emphasized in your EA. I thought that the DNR did a wonderful cost analysis with the ATV plan for the NHSF* **Response:** We have standards for road maintenance based on environmental and safety consideration. Roads on the CNNF that are open to public motorized use must meet these standards. Towns, counties and other Forest Service partners contribute towards meeting those requirements. We will continue to balance the interests for public access with our ability to maintain roads and trails appropriately.
208-2	**Comment:** *My only other concern with this plan is compliance - a map is hard to interpret. Unless all the closed roads are either signed or physically closed, it will be very difficult to know which roads can be driven. Most people including myself will find it hard to tell whether a specific secondary road is open or closed by just looking at a very small map where the scale is less than 1:24000 - my eyes are that good and the roads on this forest are very poorly signed. My crutch is GPS.* **Response:** To assist the public with knowing where they are on the ground, we will sign with a road/trail number at the major and interior intersections of designated roads and trails. ATV routes will be signed with both a number and ATV placard. We will not place physical closure devices as part of this project.
208-3	**Comment:** *I've looked at the Camp 4 access plan - the proposed action - seems to be minor inconsistency between planned closures and what is shown on your ATV maps - I assume this is a more site specific analysis - how is this tiered to this EA you wrote? This is confusing to me - maybe I'm not looking at the maps close enough. Look at the planned closures on Rds 146D and 146C for instance - these are shown as no change on your maps*. **Response:** Our MVUM will be updated yearly. The sources for updates will be from public input and from site-specific analysis such as Camp 4. There could be some delay from the time a decision is implemented on a project to when it will display on the MVUM. In the case you are referring to with Camp 4, the decision has not yet been made; therefore, the Camp 4 proposal will not be displayed.
209-1	**Comment:** *As a property owner in the Chequamegon forest area, owner of an ATV, avid hunter and hiker; I support closing as many roads to ATVs as possible. The changes in 2004 to restrict ATVs to designated trails is ineffective, not enforced, promoted baiting, encourages more cross country riding and trail blazing. Bottom line ATV's are bad for the forest in all aspects. Issue all the special permits necessary for those persons with disabilities to access all corners of the forests. For us able bodied persons, a nice walk is great. It leaves some areas that are more difficult to access and requires effort not an ATV. There has been so much abuse on the Chequamegon side of the state; a complete ATV ban except on a designated and maintained trail system*

	should be in the plan. Without maintaining the tails, enforcement has no idea or means to enforce the violators. There are so many spurs cut off main logging roads there are no large blocks of area not accessible by ATV. Even by keeping all the existing highway vehicle use roads, everyone has equal opportunity and access. I would like to see the top 5 reasons to allow ATVs in the forest. In fact even one good reason would satisfy my interest! This issue is like smoking, there are no positive benefits or upside. And remember, I own an ATV. **Response:** Our Forests, as all National Forests, are used by the public for multiple purposes; there are those who prefer to use the Forest via their ATV or HLV for various activities. When properly managed, OHV use is a legitimate use of National Forest lands. The intent of the proposed changes in OHV management on National Forests is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. These changes also allow for the balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. Enforcement is difficult because of the vast areas to cover and minimum amount of officers at the present time to do the actual enforcement work. When ATVs are kept to a route and trail system the Forest can actually be managed in a more efficient manner and enforcement areas can be targeted better.
210-1	**Comment:** *Could you please let me know what the plan is for road 2182 in Forest County? I am mainly concerned about the stretch between roads 2176 and 2174. I see that in proposals 2 and 3, the entire area is designated "Non-motorized Area". I know that most of that area is already designated wilderness, but 2182 is a major route through that area and allows access to some of my favorite hunting spots. FR2182 is a Town road.* **Response:** Thank you for inquiring. This road is under the jurisdiction of the town and therefore is unaffected by our Travel Management Project. Whatever the current use is as designated by the Town will remain. The road is actually outside of the wilderness boundary—a stretch 100' from centerline on both sides of FR 2182 is *not* designated wilderness, which allows motorized access to road.
211-1	**Comment:** *I support the proposal to reduce motorized access in the national forest. This is the right thing to do. Future generations will be grateful. I am a resident of Wisconsin, and an owner of land bordering the Chequamegon National Forest. Thank you for your protection of our environment.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
212-1	**Comment:** *Warren requested a copy of Alternative 2 of the Great Divide Ranger District. Warren indicated support of Alternative 2.* **Response:** The selected alternative was a modification of alternative 3. We believe it provides an appropriate balance of motorized and non-motorized use. Thank you for participating in the process and sharing your preference
213-1	**Comment:** *After looking over proposed changes for what could happen to our trails and forest roads in WI it is apparent that we would be losing 50% or more of these roads, is that accurate? That would be terrible. There cannot possibly be any good to come out of that. You will have less and less people enjoying the forested areas and I believe small towns would really feel the brunt of*

	this. **Response:** In our decision we added approximately 205 additional miles of roads to our travel system, which equates to a 49% reduction of the miles of roads under sole Forest Service jurisdiction. These roads are only part the total miles of roads accessing the Forest. The towns, counties, and the State have jurisdiction over approximately half of the roads accessing the Forest. The 49% of miles of sole Forest Service jurisdiction roads equates to 25% of total miles of roads on the Forest. There will be a total of approximately 6,800 miles of roads under all jurisdictions accessing the Forest. Most of the roads that will be unavailable for motorized use are unauthorized roads, which are not part of the current travel system. Many of these roads are only accessible by high clearance vehicles or not accessible at all. Additionally, the number of miles of ATV trails increased by 16 miles on the west side of the Forest. We encourage your participation in providing input to the MVUM as it is updated each year. The more specific the feedback, the better we can accommodate your needs and interests..
213-2	**Comment:** *I am with a motorcycle group called the Wisconsin Dual Sport Riders and we are a testament to how working with communities can help. We have brought people into a small community in Northern Wisconsin (namely, Wabeno) who would not otherwise be there. They are a responsible group up there with friends and family enjoying the Forest County, Marinette County and Oconto county areas which include the Chequamegon-Nicolet forest. These closures will hurt our events as well as those who recreate at other times of the year.* **Response:** We appreciate the Wisconsin Dual Sport Riders bringing "responsible" recreationists to local communities and the Forest. The effect to the club's events from the Forest proposal is unclear from the comment. We encourage you to work with the local Forest District Office on your events and bring forward any specific roads for consideration in future updates to the MVUM.
214-1	**Comment***: Steve left a message requesting information on how to respond to the Travel Management Project. He indicated that the link on the website wasn't clear*. **Response:** Thank you for providing your feedback. It is important we hear from you if the information is not accessible or clear.
214-2	**Comment:** *Steve indicated that his group is a responsible riding group - follows the rules/laws and reports anyone they see violating the laws. He is bothered by those who don't. He indicated that he is familiar with Forest Service law enforcement on the East side of the Forest*. **Response:** We encourage your enjoyment of responsible use of the Forest. Thank you for your comment.
215-1	**Comment:** *Ryan would like Alt. 1 selected. He thinks fewer roads will mean fewer deer hunters, and this will affect the economy of the Phelps and Conover areas. He asked why the FS was proposing to close so many roads*. **Response:** The implementation of this decision is not likely to have an effect on the local economy. We are committed to providing access for deer hunters. We believe our decision provides a balance of access requested by users. In our decision we added approximately 205 additional miles of roads to our travel system, which equates to a 49% reduction of the miles of roads under sole Forest Service jurisdiction. These roads are only part the total miles of roads accessing the Forest. The towns,

	counties, and the State have jurisdiction over approximately half of the roads accessing the Forest. The 49% of miles of sole Forest Service jurisdiction roads equates to 25% of total miles of roads on the Forest. There will be a total of approximately 6,800 miles of roads under all jurisdictions accessing the Forest. Most of the roads that will be unavailable for motorized use are unauthorized roads, which are not part of the current travel system. Many of these roads are only accessible by high clearance vehicles or not accessible at all. We encourage your participation in providing input to the MVUM as it is updated each year. The more specific the feedback, the better we can accommodate your needs and interests. Please also see Appendix A to this document for a more detailed discussion of the economic issues.
216-1	**Comment:** *Mr. Heinle owns 40 acres bordering the Forest at Solberg Lake since 1946. He is concerned about handicapped use. He sent a letter to the VFW, American Legion, Senators Feingold and Kohl, and Rep Obey. He would like to send us the same letter.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and concern. The Forest Service welcomes all people, including individuals who have disabilities, to the National Forests and Grasslands. Outdoor recreation is about individual choice, including the type of recreation opportunity and the type of access. We can help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We also can direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences: easy access and the sense of remoteness. We are committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking. In this project, the Travel Management Project, we are designating National Forest System roads and trails for motor vehicle use as directed by the National Travel Management Rule. The motor vehicle use designation decisions are made through a planning process with public participation that evaluates current and potential impacts due to the operation of specific vehicle types on natural and cultural resources, public safety, recreation opportunities, conflict among uses and access needs. Individuals who use a wheelchair to aid in mobility are permitted to take that device anywhere foot traffic is allowed, including in designated wilderness. A wheelchair is defined according to 36 CFR 212.2, Forest Service Manual 2350.5 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Title V, Section 507(c) as any device, including one that is battery-powered, that is designed solely for use by a mobility-impaired person for locomotion, and that is suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area. We encourage anyone with disabilities or restricted ability to contact us to discuss the type of experience they are seeking (such as fishing and dispersed camping) and their means of access and we will help them locate an area that best suits their recreational needs. Your ability to use the Forest is important to us. We encourage you to stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). The more specific you can be the better we can address your needs. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
217-1	**Comment***: Paul owns property in the Three Lakes area and deer hunts in the Hiles Township. He is concerned that hunters will be concentrated in smaller areas, creating a safety issue. I encouraged him to send in written comments and identify what roads he wanted kept open. I e- mailed him the EA cover letter and FAQs document.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and we understand your concern that many hunters could be using the same areas

	due to the motorized access available to them. We have found no evidence that hunters will only hunt where motorized access is allowed. We have heard from many other hunters who prefer a non-motorized experience. We believe our decision provides a balance between motorized and non-motorized experiences and believe there will be adequate access for everyone. We encourage you stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
218-1	**Comment:** *Patsy DeWitt wanted to know if we could designate forest roads as snowmobile trails for connecting trials from county to county in the Oconto and Marinette county areas.* **Response:** Snowmobile trails are not addressed in this project. Please contact your local district office at either Lakewood or Laona to discuss your interests.
219-1	**Comment:** *Norm prefers Alternative 1- no action. He does not want to see any roads closed. He's afraid roads will continue to be closed over time until very few will be left open. Closing roads negatively affects hunting opportunities and causes hunters to be more congregated around fewer roads. He also does not like the designation of non-motorized areas* **Response:** Please see responses to comments 181-3 and 217-1. Public involvement and input is critical to the success of the Travel Management process. We look forward to working with the public in the future process of updating the annual MVUM. For more information on the process for the addition or deletion of roads on the MVUM, see page 9 of the EA and Appendix B of the Decision Notice.
220-1	**Comment:** *Mr. Joyce indicated that he didn't see disabled permits addressed in the TMR EA and wondered how they would be affected.* **Response:** We will continue to offer the disabled ATV permits on the east side of the Forest until an expanded network of routes and trails is in place. On the west side of the Forest, disabled ATV permits will not be offered because there is already an adequate network of ATV routes and trails in place for everyone to access.
221-1	**Comment:** *Mike favors Alternative 3. He feels that closing off some roads is a good compromise. He feels there should be several areas where motorized traffic is not allowed. He also feels that roads and trails should be better maintained in areas that have been damaged by motorized use*. **Response:** We believe the selection of Alternative 3 (as modified) best meets your needs by providing a network of roads and trails that is accessible and sustainable, in addition to providing areas where motorized traffic is not allowed. We will continue to monitor these roads and trails for maintenance needs.
222-1	**Comment:** *I would like to comment on your proposed road use management plan. I don't want to see any restrictions on forest access and all existing roads to remain open. No change.*

	Response: The Forest Service has identified unmanaged recreation, particularly the unmanaged use of OHVs as one of the four threats facing National Forests and Grasslands today. OHVs are a legitimate use of the National Forest System; however, this use should be managed carefully to ensure protection of other resources such as impacts to soil, water, wildlife habitat, and other recreational visitors. The intent of the proposed changes in OHV management on National Forests is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. These changes also allow for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. The Travel Management Rule requires each National Forest to designate roads, trails, and areas that are open to public motor vehicle use. The process of identification of roads that meet these needs is outlined in this project's Environmental Assessment (EA), and results in a road system that is (1) safe and responsive to public needs and desires, (2) affordable and efficiently managed, (3) has minimal negative ecological effect on the land, and (4) is in balance with available funding for needed management actions. Many people like yourself expressed an opinion in clear support of, or opposition to, one of the alternatives considered in the EA. Each alternative reflects a compromise between recreational use and resource protection. We read each of your comments and took them into consideration in our decision. We believe the selection of Alternative 3 (as modified) best meets your needs by providing a network of roads and trails that is accessible and sustainable. We believe this alternative better addresses the need for access than Alternative2, because it provides more opportunities for access where access can be sustained. It also allows for increased access during the fall hunting season while balancing the need for non-motorized use. Choosing Alternative 1 at this time would be irresponsible. If we choose to do nothing and allow the current motor vehicle use to occur unmanaged, we believe that your enjoyment of the National Forest will decrease while the environmental impacts would likely increase. Designating roads for motorized use without site-specific information and validation may have unintended consequences. Alternative 3 (as modified) provides a more appropriate process for reviewing and designating additional roads not yet considered (unauthorized roads). Putting all the unauthorized roads that have not been evaluated onsite on the map may lead to increased environmental damage that in some cases could be irreversible. Please see the Decision Notice for a full description of our decision and rationale. The use of the adaptive management process will allow us to continue to evaluate unauthorized roads that have not yet been brought to our attention or to address other areas of concern. We encourage you to continue working with state and local governments on meeting your recreational needs and to submit road-specific comments to us for consideration in future updates to the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of our adaptive management process.
223-1	**Comment:** *I would like to cast a vote for Alternative #1. On page 19 of the EA report it states that there is no "substantial difference between the three alternatives"; however, by making a choice for alternative 1 it also "provides the most motorized use for ATVs." On satisfying both the ATV'ers and the "purists" who do not want to see any more forest taken away, I believe both parties can be satisfied with the implementing of Alternative 1.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 222-1.

223-2	**Comment:** *Thank you for educating the public with information and the chance to be heard. Everyone has an opinion concerning this topic, but if I understand this correctly - it is part of the mission of the Forest Service to preserve our wild places in this country. I believe the wildness of our WI National Forests need to be protected*. **Response:** Thank you for participating in the process. The mission of the Forest Service is to achieve quality land management under the sustainable multiple-use management. Please see response to comment 201-1 for additional information and the website address that can provide additional information related to the mission and vision of the Forest Service. We encourage public participation in projects and consider all comments submitted.
224-1	**Comment:** *Mr. Lang supports the road closures and said we need to have places where we don't have motorized recreation. He indicated that he is not against ATVs. He hopes we are successful with our proposal* **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
226-1	**Comment***: I recently found out about the proposal to shut down many of the public forest roads. With all due respect I don't like the idea. I think we would be better served to charge a fee for a license to use these roads, and use the collected fees to fund maintenance and ecology programs on and around these roads. I think the travel industry needs the extra income these roads have the potential of bringing in. Thank you for your time*. **Response:** Thank you for your input. Charging fees for general road use is not within the perview of the Forest Service. Forest users are not likely to see much change in their use as a result of this decision, however we are very interested in hearing specific feedback from forest users if they believe they have lost access to a specific area and would like a road or set of roads to be reconsidered for use.
227-1	**Comment:** *Larry said he thinks too many roads are being proposed for closure, and he won't be able to get places when he gets older. The roads being kept open don't necessarily go anywhere (recreation areas, etc); they are just old logging roads. This will result in more cars on fewer roads, which will require more maintenance than now*. **Response:** Thank you for your comment and concern. The Forest Service welcomes all people, including individuals who have disabilities, to the National Forests and Grasslands. Outdoor recreation is about individual choice, including the type of recreation opportunity and the type of access. We can help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We also can direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences: easy access and the sense of remoteness. We are committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking. In this project, the Travel Management Project, we are designating National Forest System roads and trails for motor vehicle use as directed by the National Travel Management Rule. The motor vehicle use designation decisions are made through a planning process with public participation that evaluates current and potential impacts due to the operation of specific vehicle types on natural and cultural resources, public safety, recreation opportunities, conflict among uses and access needs. Individuals who use a wheelchair to aid in mobility are permitted to take that device

	anywhere foot traffic is allowed, including in designated wilderness. A wheelchair is defined according to 36 CFR 212.2, Forest Service Manual 2350.5 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Title V, Section 507(c) as any device, including one that is battery-powered, that is designed solely for use by a mobility-impaired person for locomotion, and that is suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area. We encourage anyone with disabilities or restricted ability to contact us to discuss the type of experience they are seeking (such as fishing and dispersed camping) and their means of access and we will help them locate an area that best suits their recreational needs. Your ability to use the Forest is important to us. We encourage you to stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). The more specific you can be the better we can address your needs. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
228-1	**Comment:** *Kenneth feels that all Forest Service roads that are not gravel town roads should be closed to ATVs and to 4-wheel drive vehicles. He feels that the current system of town roads is adequate in providing public access. Hunters should walk in from these town roads. Also, he feels a lot of garbage is left in the woods along side FS roads* **Response:** Thank you for your comments.
229-1	**Comment:** *My family and I are avid sportsman, we devote a significant portion of our lives and income to deer hunting and ATV riding. Without access to half of the Nicolet National Forest both of these activities would become extremely difficult for us and thousands of other Wisconsin sportsman that use this land. Restricting vehicle access to remote roads and trails would essentially render this land unusable by all sportsman. This is a huge problem, not only for the sportsman but for deer management in general. The Chequamegon and Nicolet cover several deer management units, and with the DNR concern for population control, I don't see how limiting access to human physical ability could possibly help hunters reach the goals bestowed upon us. Furthermore, I believe continued actions such as this could lead to a huge decline in the number of people that hunt in Wisconsin.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your personal use of the Forest. Many of the roads being made unavailable for motorized use are those that (1) provide redundant access to areas of the Forest; (2) are seldom, if ever, used; or (3) present high risks to resources if used by motorized vehicles. The decision will continue to provide adequate access to the Forest for hunting. The average distance that a hunter would have to walk in or haul bait or a deer stand may increase depending on the specific areas. The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) is the State's game management agency and the we consult with the WDNR on game management issues (including those that relate to motorized access on the CNNF). We will continue to evaluate the road system over time to ensure we are providing adequate access for all uses.
229-2	**Comment:** *I also believe this proposal could have a crippling effect on the ATV industry in Wisconsin. A sport that was almost unheard of ten years ago has exploded into one of the most popular things to do in the north woods. This has gotten so popular ATV sales have surpassed snowmobile sales the last couple of years. Not to mention the small towns and businesses along ATV trails that are now thriving due to increased revenue. The article tries to downplay the effect of this plan on existing trails and proposes new trails to appease the masses for the time being, But if we allow this to happen what is going to be taken away next*

	year? or the year after? A growing sport needs area to expand, with limited area the progress of the sport will be halted and so will the economic benefit. **Response:** We agree that ATV use is increasing in Wisconsin (see Recreation report for SCORP and other data supporting this conclusion). However, scientific evidence is not available that supports the conclusion that concentrating motorized use on less miles of roads will result in a decrease in motorized recreation overall. The 2004 Forest Plan for the CNNF provides for expanded trail development which we are continuing to plan and propose in accordance with the guidance in the Plan. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue. Please also see response to 181-3 for an explanation of why we are implementing this change – one of the reasons is the increase in the numbers of ATVs.
229-3	**Comment:** *I do not believe the concern of erosion on these roads that are not maintained is worth the devastation these closures would cause sportsman, deer management, and the economy. Thank you for allowing me to voice my opinion which is shared by many others.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. This project documents the assessment of the nature and importance of the physical, biological, social and economic effects of this decision. The environmental assessment not only analyzed the impacts to soils, but other resource areas including transportation planning, hydrology, threatened and endangered and sensitive species, wildlife, non-native invasive species, heritage resources, recreation, social and economic resource areas. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
230-1	**Comment:** V*oice message inquiring about 503C. Wants to make sure it would not close.* **Response:** The commenter was actually referring to 503E, a system road open to highway-legal vehicles that will remain open.
231-1	**Comment:** *Mr. Rintamaki called back and left a voice message. He indicated that it was a very bad idea to close secondary roads.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 181-3.
232-1	**Comment:** *I am absolutely opposed to any and all road closings in the Chequamegon-Nicolet Forests. And I think the roads that are now bermed off should be reopened. This new proposal is not a rule, it is a sentence imposed on the sportsman of this state. I am a 61 year old resident of Crandon and have lived here all my life. I travel the Nicolet extensively year around. I can see no problems anywhere in my experience that should lead to this disastrous series of road closings. These are old logging roads that the Forest Service does not maintain anyway! They have not changed if the 60 years I have been using them. This seems like another attempt by a few people who are probably not aware of the real situation, or really do not care what impact it has on people like myself who have used these roads for years. To use these old roads and trails unencumbered has been a part of this area since before the Nicolet was formed. To shut down more of them is in my opinion, a freedom lost.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your opinions and concerns. W did not re-evaluate any existing gated or bermed roads; these roads were closed based on a previous site-specific project analysis and decision. The Travel Management Rule does not

	require the Forest Service to reconsider any previous decisions that allow, restrict, or prohibit motorized use. The Travel Management Rule includes a paragraph in 212.50 to clarify that these previous decisions may be incorporated into decisions made under this rule. Please also see response to comment 181-3.
232-2	**Comment:** *I understand this is a nationwide proposal for all Forest Service land. To this I say that one size does not fit all.* **Response:** You are right; the Travel Management Rule is a national rule regarding travel management on National Forest System lands. This project is the implementation of this rule for this Forest specifically. We encourage you to read the decision for this project and the process for update included in Appendix b of the Decision Notice.
232-3	**Comment:** *It appears the Forest Service has lost sight of what the Nicolet Forest was originally set up to do. It is supposed to be a working forest with its focus on helping the LOCAL population. You have acres upon acres of falling down timber that needs to be cut. I spent 33 years as a salesman, selling Forestry Equipment in this area. In the 1970's I could call on 20 different logging jobs in the area north of Argonne, and East toward Tipler. In the last fifteen or so years, I would be lucky to find one or two. I am aware that in the last couple of years, you are cutting a lot of spruce, but if it wasn't dying you probably wouldn't. The water is still clean, the air is still good, the plants and bugs are still there. I don't believe shutting down more roads and making criminals out of good citizens is a policy worth pursuing. Another thought, if this policy has anything to do with wolves, and their protection, be aware that they have exceeded the recommended numbers in record time with the roads as they are. Remember this is The Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest, not the Chequamegon -Nicolet National Park.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. With regard to the wolf population: While one of the outcomes of this project would be a reduction in the number of miles of open roads within wolf pack territories, it is not one of the purposes of this project. It is true that the amount of timber harvesting on the Forest has declined over time Recent appeals and litigation of project decisions has reduced the amount of timber available to be sold. We continue to work to maintain or increase the timber sale program to benefit local economies. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
233-1	**Comment***: I support the restrictions on the use of vehicles in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest. I'll be 80 my next birthday, which means it's unlikely I'll ever get into some of the remote regions in the national forest, but everybody doesn't have to go everywhere. In fact, it's better if hardly anyone gets to some of those isolated locations. We already have plenty of access to almost every place in Wisconsin, so I don't see that restricting the use of motorized vehicles in the national forest would work a hardship on anyone* **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
233-2	**Comment:** *The only exception I'd make is in areas where excessive deer numbers are causing problems for the forest. Then, I think the rule against motorized vehicles should be suspended during the gun season to allow hunters to get in and bring deer out.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. The decision to accept Alternative 3 (as modified) will continue to provide

	opportunities for access where access can be sustained. It also allows for increase access during the fall hunting season. The continued management of the deer herd is important to maintain the health of the Forest as well as support an important part of our heritage.
234-1	**Comment:** *George indicated that his organization represents 161 hunting, fishing, and trapping groups. He saw the article in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel. This is the first time he has seen a public notice. He is concerned about the 30 day comment period being too short. He asked if comments received during the fall hunting season could be incorporated. He asked if we could delay the final publication of the map to February or March so that the comments from the fall hunting season could be incorporated. He also asked for a copy of our mailing and media list.* **Response:** We started engaging the public with a brochure to reach the sportsmen in the fall of 2006. We have held several open houses and met with several groups to discuss the process and the intended outcome, the publication of a MVUM in January 2009. Recognizing the importance of continuing to connect with people who use the forest, we have incorporated opportunities for people to be involved even after the map is published. Although there were several requests to extend the comment period on the EA, regulation does not allow for an extension of this 30 day period. It is important to us that people have the opportunity to share there concerns and specific roads they would like to be considered for addition or deletion from the map. Please see the Decision Notice and Appendix B of the decision for the process that will be utilized to update the map. We intend to focus our efforts on education and feedback in the first year.
235-1	**Comment***: I would prefer Alt #1. I have secured a conditional permit to use the road you have labeled as 508D which (as I understand) give me exclusive use to use to it as my driveway to access my hunting land on a seasonal basis. I would prefer an alternative that would formally close the road (508D) to all motorized traffic (except for my personal use of access). I have spent $5000.00 on maintaining the road in accordance with the 10 conditions listed on my recorded Conditional use permit. The problem is the ATVs and Bear Hunters that investigate the road when I am not there in the summer.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Conditional permits allow the permitee to maintain the road under permit. The permit does not however preclude use by other members of the public on those portions of the road crossing National Forest lands. FR508D was also analyzed and determination was made that resource risks associated with the road are low.
235-2	**Comment:** *I am also disappointed that both Alt 2 and 3 close roads 510, 534 and 518. 518 is the Squaw Creek recreation area, 534 and 510 have recently logged. My road 508D has recently been marked for timber sale but the forestry dept had left the remaining over mature spruce that keep falling on my property and destroy my camping equipment. I hope that when you do find a logger that will bid on the timber on 508D that they will be responsible for the ruts and heavy traffic on 508D as they skid the timber out to FR508. The care of that road is a deep concern to me as it is for Tony Erba who was mentioned in the AP story last Sunday*. **Response:** Thank you for your road specific comment. FR510 will remain open to motorized access due to recent reconstruction and low risk to resources. FR 534 is identified for both hlv and atv in the selected alternative due to high values

	and low risks to resources associated with the road. FR 518 is identified for hlv and atv in the selected alternative because it is currently an open system road on atv maps and accesses a dispersed atv campsite at end of road. Regarding administrative use of FR508D for timber harvest, the timber purchaser is responsible for marinating the road pursuant to the timber sale contract.
235-3	**Comment:** *I am also curious that I had not heard of this effort until last Sunday. In the past private land owners inside the National Forest had been notified by mail, when the USFS had planned to change something that may affect their property or environment. The AP story had mentioned meetings last October 2007. I hope that this was just an oversight and not a policy shift to keep USFS plans from those that may be affected by those proposed activities.* **Response:** We are sorry you have not heard about this project before however we have been conducting major outreach to people to inform them of this process. We held 15 open houses in 2007 to solicit public input on specific roads. Ten open houses were held in January and February 2007, five for the public and five for governmental entities. Five open houses were held in October 2007 to present our initial proposal to the public and to solicit additional comments. In addition, we sent press releases to an extensive statewide media list that includes newspapers, television stations, and radio stations. We will continue to provide opportunities for the public to provide input to the map as it is updated each year. The more specific the feedback the better we can accommodate people's needs and interests. We encourage you to stay engaged. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for more specifics on the process
236-1	**Comment:** *Mr. Marcell left a message that he would like to discuss access. He is partially disabled. Claims that Forest Service is denying use of public lands*. **Response:** Thank your for your comment and concern. The Forest Service welcomes all people, including individuals who have disabilities, to the National Forests and Grasslands. Outdoor recreation is about individual choice, including the type of recreation opportunity and the type of access. We can help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We also can direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences: easy access and the sense of remoteness. We are committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking. In this project, the Travel Management Project, we are designating National Forest System roads and trails for motor vehicle use as directed by the National Travel Management Rule. The motor vehicle use designation decisions are made through a planning process with public participation that evaluates current and potential impacts due to the operation of specific vehicle types on natural and cultural resources, public safety, recreation opportunities, conflict among uses and access needs. Individuals who use a wheelchair to aid in mobility are permitted to take that device anywhere foot traffic is allowed, including in designated wilderness. A wheelchair is defined according to 36 CFR 212.2, Forest Service Manual 2350.5 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Title V, Section 507(c) as any device, including one that is battery-powered, that is designed solely for use by a mobility-impaired person for locomotion, and that is suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area. We encourage anyone with disabilities or restricted ability to contact us to discuss the type of experience they are seeking (such as fishing and dispersed camping) and their means of access and we will help them locate an area that best suits their recreational needs. Your ability to use the Forest is important to us. We encourage you to stay engaged and let

	us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). The more specific you can be the better we can address your needs. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
237-1	**Comment:** *Received a voice mail from Erica requesting information on the sequence of events for the final decision for the Travel Management Project.* **Response:** The final decision has been made and is available on the CNNF website at: http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/cnnf/rec/tmr/index.html This decision is appealable as described in the Decision Notice.
238-1	**Comment:** *My family and I are in strong support of Alternative 1. Closing these roads will significantly impact our ability to enjoy the north woods for a variety of outdoor activities. We are not "off-roaders" and respect the areas we explore. We use these access points for exploration, hunting, berry picking, fishing, kayaking, hiking, camping, etc. There are plenty of existing wilderness areas for those that want to get away from motor vehicles completely. We don't need more* **Response:** The Forest Service has identified unmanaged recreation, particularly the unmanaged use of OHVs as one of the four threats facing National Forests and Grasslands today. OHVs are a legitimate use of the National Forest System; however, this use should be managed carefully to ensure protection of other resources such as impacts to soil, water, wildlife habitat, and other recreational visitors. The intent of the proposed changes in OHV management on National Forests is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. These changes also allow for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. The Travel Management Rule requires each National Forest to designate roads, trails, and areas that are open to public motor vehicle use. The process of identification of roads that meet these needs is outlined in this project's Environmental Assessment (EA), and results in a road system that is (1) safe and responsive to public needs and desires, (2) affordable and efficiently managed, (3) has minimal negative ecological effect on the land, and (4) is in balance with available funding for needed management actions. Many people like yourself expressed an opinion in clear support of, or opposition to, one of the alternatives considered in the EA. Each alternative reflects a compromise between recreational use and resource protection. We read each of your comments and took them into consideration in our decision. We believe the selection of Alternative 3 (as modified) best meets your needs by providing a network of roads and trails that is accessible and sustainable. We believe this alternative better addresses the need for access than Alternative2, because it provides more opportunities for access where access can be sustained. It also allows for increased access during the fall hunting season while balancing the need for non-motorized use. Choosing Alternative 1 at this time would be irresponsible. If we choose to do nothing and allow the current motor vehicle use to occur unmanaged, we believe that your enjoyment of the National Forest will decrease while the environmental impacts would likely increase. Designating roads for motorized use without site-specific information and validation may have unintended consequences. Alternative 3 (as modified) provides a more appropriate process for reviewing and designating additional roads not yet considered (unauthorized roads). Putting all the unauthorized roads that have not been evaluated onsite on the map may lead to increased environmental

	damage that in some cases could be irreversible. Please see the Decision Notice for a full description of our decision and rationale. The use of the adaptive management process will allow us to continue to evaluate unauthorized roads that have not yet been brought to our attention or to address other areas of concern. We encourage you to continue working with state and local governments on meeting your recreational needs and to submit road-specific comments to us for consideration in future updates to the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of this process.
239-1	**Comment:** *Mr. Busjahn expressed concern (via phone) over being able to access his property, which is located off of Hwy GG on the Great Divide Ranger District. He indicated that on the map he had the road to his property off of 866 was displaying as an unauthorized road and was concerned that it would not be open to motorized use. The route he takes to access his property is FR866 off of GG to the unnumbered unauthorized road going south off of 866 to his property. He indicated that he is aware of the fact that 866 off of GG crosses private. He has never had a problem going that way, but would contact the landowner* **Response:** The decision includes the designation of highway legal (hlv) use on both the portion of 866 on the National Forest and, west of the private parcel, and on the unnumbered road going south into your property.
240-1	**Comment:** *Mr. Busjahn owns an 80-acre parcel of land in T 42 N R4 W Sec. 17 N1/2 of SW ?. He is concerned that the current access route that he uses to access is property is not showing up on the TMR maps. He indicated that he uses FR 1276, a road that intersects with 1276 heading south (I think it is W230164) to FR 866, and an unnumbered road that goes south off of FR 866 to his property. He and other property owners in this area have been maintaining many of the roads in this area through mowing and other means for 40+ years. He feels that they should be left open as are needed to access the private parcels, are valuable to recreational users of the forest, and are needed to provide good access for fire suppression. The roads also need to be left open to their property because it is Forest Crop Law (FCL). He agrees that they should be open only to HLV and not to ATV's.* **Response:** It was later determined that the route Mr. Busjahn actually used to access his property is FR866 off of GG to the unnumbered unauthorized road going south off of 866 to his property. Mr. Busjahn understands that FR866 off of GG crosses private land. He has never had a problem using it and will contact the private land owner. The decision includes the designation of highway-legal use on both the portion of 866 on Forest Service land, west of the private parcel and on the unnumbered road going south into Mr. Busjahn's property.
241-1	**Comment:** *All roads, trails, paths, or passageways should remain open to the general public. None should be closed as to our constitutional right to use all trails and passageways. These roads, trails, etc. should be open to all, I repeat, all types of passage, vehicle or foot travel. After all, government land belongs to all the people, not to those who run the DNR or the Forest Service, or our morons in Washington.* **Response:** When created, management of the Chequamegon and Nicolet National Forests was based on the Weeks Act (March 1, 1911) as amended by the Clarke-McNary Act (June 7, 1924). The Weeks Act authorized Congress to appropriate funds to acquire lands for "the conservation land improvement of the navigability of a river," and it focused on the lands containing the

	headwaters of such rivers. The Clarke-McNary Act broadened the purpose for purchase of lands for Forest Reserves by authorizing purchase of "such forested, cut-over, or denuded land within the watersheds of navigable streams as…may be necessary to the regulation of the flow of navigable streams or for the production of timber." Since that time Congress has passed a body of laws that requires a broader natural resource focus when it comes to the management of National Forest lands. Laws such as the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960, the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, and the National Forest Management Act of 1976 are examples of laws that apply to these lands and require consideration of a broader array of resource issues and public values than did the two acts under which the Forests were originally established. The decision for this project falls within the 2004 Forest Plan goals associated with the body of laws directing management of National Forest lands, including the Weeks Act and the Clarke-McNary Act.
242-1	**Comment:** *He talked about the Goodman Timber /County project for a trail on the Goodman Timber property. Apparently the project fell through because the routes also accommodated cars and trucks and therefore could not be designated as a trail. He indicated that Harv Skjerven had approved a 1 1\2 to 2 mile trail/routes on the Eagle River Florence District to connect to the trail on the Goodman property. His group is looking for a way to get from east to west or west to east across the Eagle River Florence District***.** **Response:** This project was put on hold until Florence County was assured of State funding, which we understand they received in late August. We intend for this portion of the connection to be completed in time for inclusion on the 2010 MVUM.
243-1	**Comment:** *I vote in favor of the Alternative 3 proposal*. **Response:** Thank you for sharing your preference. Please see the Decision Notice for a description of the selected alternative.
243-2	**Comment:** *I would also suggest contacting the Ruff Grouse Society for possible trail closure coordination as they may be able to plant clover on any suitable trails. Although I live in Alaska, during October I Grouse hunt in the Laona - Townsend area. I routinely find the most birds along open trails through thicker 2nd growth aspen with clover. I am familiar with many of the trails that are proposed for closure, and this could be a marriage made in Grouse heaven! This may also help quiet the deer hunters***.** **Response:** We actively partner with conservation and user-group organizations such as the Ruffed Grouse Society and will continue to involve such organizations in project-level planning on the Forest.
244-1	**Comment:** *I just read an article about the planned closing of many miles of roads in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest. I was not aware that this plan was even in the works. After reading the article I was very upset about this. This is land that is there for the public to enjoy and not make it unavailable to many people that want to use it by using a vehicle. Is there anything that can be done to get this policy changed or is it too late? I feel that there was a poor job done making the public aware of this plan.* **Response:** We are sorry you have not heard about this project before however we have been conducting major outreach to

	people to inform them of this process. We held 15 open houses in 2007 to solicit public input on specific roads. Ten open houses were held in January and February 2007, five for the public and five for governmental entities. Five open houses were held in October 2007 to present our initial proposal to the public and to solicit additional comments. In addition, we sent press releases to an extensive statewide media list that includes newspapers, television stations, and radio stations. We will continue to provide opportunities for the public to provide input to the map as it is updated each year. The more specific the feedback the better we can accommodate people's needs and interests. We encourage you to stay engaged. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for more specifics on the process.
245-1	**Comment:** *As a former Wisconsinite and still recreator in Wisconsin when I return to visit family, please accept this email as my opposition to the closure of the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest area to motorized vehicles.* **Response:** The Forest Service has identified unmanaged recreation, particularly the unmanaged use of OHVs as one of the four threats facing National Forests and Grasslands today. OHVs are a legitimate use of the National Forest System; however, this use should be managed carefully to ensure protection of other resources such as impacts to soil, water, wildlife habitat, and other recreational visitors. The intent of the proposed changes in OHV management on National Forests is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. These changes also allow for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. The Travel Management Rule requires each National Forest to designate roads, trails, and areas that are open to public motor vehicle use. The process of identification of roads that meet these needs is outlined in this project's Environmental Assessment (EA), and results in a road system that is (1) safe and responsive to public needs and desires, (2) affordable and efficiently managed, (3) has minimal negative ecological effect on the land, and (4) is in balance with available funding for needed management actions. Many people like yourself expressed an opinion in clear support of, or opposition to, one of the alternatives considered in the EA. Each alternative reflects a compromise between recreational use and resource protection. We read each of your comments and took them into consideration in our decision. We believe the selection of Alternative 3 (as modified) best meets your needs by providing a network of roads and trails that is accessible and sustainable. We believe this alternative better addresses the need for access than Alternative2, because it provides more opportunities for access where access can be sustained. It also allows for increased access during the fall hunting season while balancing the need for non-motorized use. Choosing Alternative 1 at this time would be irresponsible. If we choose to do nothing and allow the current motor vehicle use to occur unmanaged, we believe that your enjoyment of the National Forest will decrease while the environmental impacts would likely increase. Designating roads for motorized use without site-specific information and validation may have unintended consequences. Alternative 3 (as modified) provides a more appropriate process for reviewing and designating additional roads not yet considered (unauthorized roads). Putting all the unauthorized roads that have not been evaluated onsite on the map may lead to increased environmental damage that in some cases could be irreversible. Please see the Decision Notice for a full description of our decision and rationale. The use of the adaptive management process will allow us to continue to evaluate unauthorized roads that have not yet been

	brought to our attention or to address other areas of concern. We encourage you to continue working with state and local governments on meeting your recreational needs and to submit road-specific comments to us for consideration in future updates to the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of our adaptive management process.
246-1	**Comment:** *I strongly support Alternative 2 (Forest Service recommendation) because the reduction of roads to motor vehicular traffic should reduce the noise and water pollution as well as soil damage in the forest and the subsequent impact on wild and plant life.* **Response:** Thank you for reviewing the EA and sharing your concerns.
246-2	**Comment:** *I strongly support Alternative 2 (Forest Service recommendation) because by limiting access to the forest roads and trails the opportunities for unauthorized use should be diminished, and the cost of law enforcement and road/trail maintenance should scale with the amount of road open to the public for motor vehicular use making funds available for other uses.* **Response:** We believe the decision provides a balance of motorized and non-motorized while protecting important forest resources..
246-3	**Comment***: I strongly support Alternative 2 (Forest Service recommendation) because reduced motor vehicular access may make it safe for other users of the park such as hikers and mountain bikers, since more non-motor vehicular trails would presumably be available for the other uses, and activities such as hiking, bird watching and fishing are less likely to be disturbed by motor vehicular traffic, and trails not used by motor vehicles are often easier to hike since the tires have not disturbed the soil.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
246-4	**Comment:** *I strongly support Alternative 2 (Forest Service recommendation) because seven hundred and eighty nine miles of ATV accessible roads and trails seems quite sufficient (equivalent of driving from Park Falls to Youngstown, OH), and there is an equivalent amount of ATV access in the surrounding area.* **Response:** This decision is consistent with the Goals and Objectives in the 2004 Forest Plan. ATV trail maintenance and development is an important component of the plan. The amount of trails available for public use and the designation of a motor vehicle route system should provide the balance of access and protection of forest resources.
247-1	**Comment:** *That it is necessary to close off the deep woods is a sad thing--BUT--I can understand why it needs to be done. I haven't been in the deep woods since childhood, and while it molded my being, there are all too many people now who do not have respect for what's there. And if you were to talk to them about "molding" a mind and heart set, they would look at you blankly and wonder WHAT you were talking about. I wholly support the efforts to close areas of the forest that are too precious to lose. GO FOR IT!*

	Response: Thank you for sharing your concerns.
249-1	**Comment:** *Andy said he is opposed to any road closures.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 181-3.
250-1	**Comment:** *Now that I'm a bit older like many others I can't walk as far, as fast, and would not be able to get a larger animal out without the use of motorized vetches. Also consider the fact that older people have hip and knee replacement they also can not walk great distances so in fact you are attempting to stop those from enjoying OUR National Park systems. If anything else you should be adding more motorized roads than trying to close them*. **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please note that the proposed project is located on National Forest lands and not within a National Park. Please also see response to comment 180-1.
251-1	**Comment:** *Kurt supports Alternative 2. He believes it is a good compromise because the seasonal closures will provide good protection of the elk herd. There are very different opinions over road closures. Closing the roads permanently would probably be better for the elk, so seasonal closures are a compromise for folks who don't want to lose motorized access to certain areas of the forest*. **Response:** Thank you for your comment. For more elk information please see response to comment 439-3.
252-1	**Comment:** *Lee would like to see Alternative 2 chosen*. **Response:** Thank you for your sharing your preference. Please see the Decision Notice for a description of the selected alternative.
254-1	**Comment:** *I am writing to express my dismay at the recent talk of closing over 50% of the roads in the CNNF to motorized traffic. My family and I have hunted in the CNNF for 3 generations and this change would make it virtually impossible for this to continue. We don't have the kind of money to purchase hundreds of acres of land simply for recreation and rely on state and federal lands for these purposes. Please understand that changes such as this affect real people in important ways. Also please keep in mind the hundreds of millions of dollars spent by hunters and fishermen not only in Wisconsin but throughout the country, a portion of which is used to support the national forests.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your personal use of the Forest. Many of the roads being made unavailable for motorized use are those that (1) provide redundant access to areas of the Forest; (2) are seldom, if ever, used; or (3) present high risks to resources if used by motorized vehicles. The decision will continue to provide adequate access to the Forest for hunting. The average distance that a hunter would have to walk in or haul bait or a deer stand may increase depending on the specific areas. The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) is the State's game management agency and we consult with the WDNR on game management issues (including those that relate to motorized access on the CNNF). We will continue to evaluate the road system over time to ensure we are providing adequate access for all uses. We encourage you to stay engaged

	in the process. If there are specific roads you would like for us to consider for inclusion on the map please let us know.
255-1	**Comment:** *The EA for the CNNF Travel Management Project gains high praise from me for its science-based process and decision making, including a highly visible effort to consider the impact of changes well into the future. The EA has linked the current and future health and growth of forests and the components of their ecosystems to actions that can be taken today. This is a most important step. Well grounded decisions today will produce robust future forests and provide natural habitat and distribution of native plants and animals, which we depend upon in a variety of ways*. **Response:** Thank you for taking the time to read the EA and provide your feedback.
255-2	**Comment:** *Given appropriate territory, I'm of the opinion that wolf populations will stabilize, if not drop, as deer distribution returns to sustainable levels in relation to wolves and this balance will allow forest crops to recover from excess browse that has decreased regrowth of oak, birch and other tree, shrub, and ground cover species allowing future productive harvests of these species. Nature has so often shown its resilience and ability to balance species far better than human management. This EA respects this potential.* **Response:** We believe the decision for this project provides a balance of use and protection.
255-3	**Comment:** *A number of walking, hiking, birding, hunting, snow shoeing...quite sport trails need to be sustained to quench the thirst for experiences in nature that motorized activities will never provide. Richard Louv's work highlights this connection for development of the human brain and avoiding the current "Nature-Deficit Disorder", which I suggest not only appears in children, but also in adults that do not have a direct connection with the world in which we live. Future leaders need to be well grounded and that word is used purposefully.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We believe this decision provides a balance of roads and trails formotorized and non motorized use. The Forest Plan provides a balance of areas for quiet solitude and other areas where users may have the opportunity for a different experience. This project is consistent with the Forest Plan.
255-4	**Comment:** *For individuals who need motorized assistance, such as handicapped hunters, bough and firewood collectors, access should be allowed by written permit, specifying trails open for this purpose during seasons that protect the trails and the ecosystem.* **Response:** The Nicolet side of the Forest currently has a Disabled User ATV permit system. These permits are issued in conjunction with a valid DNR hunting permit for persons with disabilities and are valid for specific open roads or open roads inside a designated area. These permits will continue to be offered on the Nicolet side of the Forest until an expanded network of ATV routes and trails is in place. Disabled ATV user permits are not issued on the Chequamegon side of the Forest because an adequate ATV network of roads and trails is in place for all Forest users.
255-5	**Comment:** *Wise consumption of fossil fuels has finally gained national priority. Promoting activities that consume fuels, beyond*

	utilitarian needs is counter productive to our national security and to the current and future quality of our forests, our air, our waters, and our food resources. **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
255-6	**Comment:** *Considering the impact and costs of introduction of terrestrial and aquatic invasive species is so important. Every view one takes of them is expensive...displacement and loss of native plants and animals, control measures, material costs, and the labor involved. It is far less expensive to take measures to avoid or contain them, that to engage in their management after they have spread* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. We believe this decision along with other actions we are taking on the forest will provide adequate protection and minimize the spread of invasive species..
256-1	**Comment:** *Because Alternative 2 allows for the seasonal closure of select trails through sensitive elk calving areas and creates a permanent closure of Forest Road 1265A through a calving/wintering area, I want to register my support for Alternative 2 and ask that the Forest Service follow through and implement these changes. Thank You.* *[Also in letters 256, 280-283, 297-309, 294-296, 310, 406, and 597)* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concern about the elk herd. Please see response to comment 439-3 for information on the elk herd. Please also see the Decision Notice for a description of our decision.
257-1	**Comment:** *I'm against restricting access to my land. It was my money used to manage the land. In some cases it was my money used to purchase the land. Now under the guise of conservation you are using my money to keep me out. Protectivism would better describe your motives* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. Please see response to comment 241-1.
257-2	**Comment:** *The "roads" to which you refer, are, more often than not, trails. Many become impassable with the passage of time. They do remain viable, providing pathways to the public. A public which is very reluctant, for good reason, to venture into a tractless forest***.** **Response:** Foot travel through the Forest is allowed everywhere; it is a personal choice to venture out into these areas.
257-3	**Comment:** *Our population is aging. The youth either cannot afford to, or cares not to, spend time in the forest. An aging population cannot venture into a roadless forest***.** **Response:** Thank you for your comment and concern. The Forest Service welcomes all people, including individuals who have disabilities, to the National Forests and Grasslands. Outdoor recreation is about individual choice, including the type of recreation opportunity and the type of access. We can help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We also can direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized

	areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences: easy access and the sense of remoteness. We are committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking. In this project, the Travel Management Project, we are designating National Forest System roads and trails for motor vehicle use as directed by the National Travel Management Rule. The motor vehicle use designation decisions are made through a planning process with public participation that evaluates current and potential impacts due to the operation of specific vehicle types on natural and cultural resources, public safety, recreation opportunities, conflict among uses and access needs. Individuals who use a wheelchair to aid in mobility are permitted to take that device anywhere foot traffic is allowed, including in designated wilderness. A wheelchair is defined according to 36 CFR 212.2, Forest Service Manual 2350.5 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Title V, Section 507(c) as any device, including one that is battery-powered, that is designed solely for use by a mobility-impaired person for locomotion, and that is suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area. We encourage anyone with disabilities or restricted ability to contact us to discuss the type of experience they are seeking (such as fishing and dispersed camping) and their means of access and we will help them locate an area that best suits their recreational needs. Your ability to use the Forest is important to us. We encourage you to stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). The more specific you can be the better we can address your needs. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
257-4	**Comment:** *Are the Native Americans exempt from new restrictions? I'd bet that they are. If they are not, the courts will overturn any restriction that you might impose*. **Response:** The 2005 Travel Management Rule applies to all National Forests and grasslands. The CNNF Travel Management project included consultation with Native American Tribes; no impacts to Tribal access were identified by the Tribes (see EA).
257-5	**Comment:** *What you want to do, in my opinion, is to create a semi-wilderness area. Limiting vehicle traffic is a top priority. You have tried before, you will try again. As long as I pay your salary, you'll beat me over the head with my own money.* **Response:** The purpose of this project is to ensure the public has a sustainable network for roads and trails to utilize to access the National Forest into the future.
257-6	**Comment:** *I have roamed eastern Florence county for 50 plus years. My children, and certainly my grandchildren will never share my experiences. Thanks to narrow minded selfish people such as yourself***.** **Response:** Access to the National Forest for you and your family is important to us. If there are specific roads or trails that you feel have been made unavailable for your use that you would like for us to consider please let us know. We will evaluate every road that is brought to our attention that you may be currently using.
257-7	**Comment:** *Laws already exist which restrict the use of all terrain and four wheel drive vehicles. Enforce them. Punish the culprit(s) not the public***.**

	Response: Violators are given citations and dealt with in the Federal judicial system. Sometimes all ATV riders and four wheel drive operators are given a bad reputation. In fact most operators follow the rules.
257-8	**Comment:** *The wolves are doing just fine. Of course, you know that*. **Response:** While one of the outcomes of this project would be a reduction in the number of miles of open roads within wolf pack territories, it is not one of the purposes of this project
257-9	**Comment:** *Now you can go back to your computer. Run another worse case scenario program. Scare the public into believing that our forests are being destroyed by overuse. Truth is that no use is your goal. Lincoln was right. You can fool some of the people all the time. You will, of course, succeed. Your money, I mean mine, is endless. I'm old. I shouldn't care***.** **Response:** The Forest Service has identified unmanaged recreation, particularly the unmanaged use of OHVs as one of the four threats facing National Forests and Grasslands today. OHVs are a legitimate use of the National Forest System; however, this use should be managed carefully to ensure protection of other resources such as impacts to soil, water, wildlife habitat, and other recreational visitors. The intent of the proposed changes in OHV management on National Forests is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. These changes also allow for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. The Travel Management Rule requires each National Forest to designate roads, trails, and areas that are open to public motor vehicle use. The process of identification of roads that meet these needs is outlined in this project's Environmental Assessment (EA), and results in a road system that is (1) safe and responsive to public needs and desires, (2) affordable and efficiently managed, (3) has minimal negative ecological effect on the land, and (4) is in balance with available funding for needed management actions. Many people like yourself expressed an opinion in clear support of, or opposition to, one of the alternatives considered in the EA. Each alternative reflects a compromise between recreational use and resource protection. We read each of your comments and took them into consideration in our decision. We believe the selection of Alternative 3 (as modified) best meets your needs by providing a network of roads and trails that is accessible and sustainable. We believe this alternative better addresses the need for access than Alternative2, because it provides more opportunities for access where access can be sustained. It also allows for increased access during the fall hunting season while balancing the need for non-motorized use. Choosing Alternative 1 at this time would be irresponsible. If we choose to do nothing and allow the current motor vehicle use to occur unmanaged, we believe that your enjoyment of the National Forest will decrease while the environmental impacts would likely increase. Designating roads for motorized use without site-specific information and validation may have unintended consequences. Alternative 3 (as modified) provides a more appropriate process for reviewing and designating additional roads not yet considered (unauthorized roads). Putting all the unauthorized roads that have not been evaluated onsite on the map may lead to increased environmental damage that in some cases could be irreversible. Please see the Decision Notice for a full description of our decision and rationale. The use of the adaptive management process will allow us to continue to evaluate unauthorized roads that have not yet been

	brought to our attention or to address other areas of concern. We encourage you to continue working with state and local governments on meeting your recreational needs and to submit road-specific comments to us for consideration in future updates to the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of our adaptive management process.
258-1	**Comment:** *Hunts in Whisker Lake Wilderness area. Only drives on firelanes (system roads). Wanted to know how these were affected. Specifically mentioned FR2150***.** **Response:** FR2150 is a town road. Town roads will remain unchanged.
258-2	**Comment:** *Was concerned how this action may have an effect on hunter density by concentrating hunters more. Would like more access available during hunting season to disperse hunters more*. **Response:** Thank you for your comment and we understand your concern that many hunters could be using the same areas due to the motorized access available to them. The reduction in miles of roads available for motorized use would not be expected to meaningfully affect hunter success. We have found no evidence that hunters will only hunt where motorized access is allowed. We have heard from many other hunters who prefer a non-motorized experience. We believe our decision provides a balance between motorized and non-motorized experiences and believe there will be adequate access for everyone. We encourage you stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
259-1	**Comment:** *John is a wildlife photographer who feels this action will affect his work significantly. He spent a great deal of time explaining his needs and history of work*. **Response:** We thank you for input into this project. We do encourage you to submit additional roads for consideration in the annual MVUM update. This process is outlined on page 9 of the EA and in Appendix B of the Decision Notice.
260-1	**Comment:** *He is aging and is devastated over these proposed closures. He is nearing retirement and hunts north of Mary Lake. He would like to see road remain open during hunting season (fall) and for a month during trapping season*. **Response:** All of the roads immediately north of Mary Lake will remain open to hlvs, as well as several other roads to the west and further north. If there are other specific roads that are of concern, please identify them and send them in for review.
261-1	**Comment***: Concerned about access to hunting area off Strong Road. I told him no changes were proposed in that area*. **Response:** There will be no changes in this area.
262-1	**Comment:** *As a taxpayer, hunter, fisherman, trapper and outdoor enthusiast I am shocked that such a rule would ever be developed. The National Forests are for the recreation of all. To limit access in such a way essentially stops the ability to see the*

	majority of the National Forests. Why have these great forests if we can't enjoy them. **Response:** National Forests are used by the public for multiple purposes. When properly managed, OHV use is a legitimate use of National Forest lands. The intent of the proposed change in OHV management on National Forests is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. Also see response to comment 181-3.
262-2	**Comment:** *I realize there are special interest groups who are putting pressure on the government so that untouched areas of our National Forests can be preserved for wolves and elk. Both of these animals were reintroduced into Wisconsin. I'll bet if the general public knew when these animals were considered for reintroduction that areas of the National Forests would be essentially closed off they never would have been reintroduced*. **Response:** Analysis of effects to wolves, elk, and other wildlife species is required through NEPA, and while effects to these species are considered in project-level planning, neither is an overriding concern in the overall decision-making process for most projects (including this one).
262-3	**Comment:** *I am a graduate of UW-Stevens Point back in 1974 with a B.S. degree in Water Resource Management. I am very environmentally aware but I am also aware that you must let people see the value of the National Forests so that they continue to be protected. If I can't visit the National Forests on roads that are already established I'm not sure I would vote to continue to keep them off the state's tax roll or even continue to pay the salaries of the individuals such as yourself to take care of them*. **Response:** Most roads people currently use to access the National Forest will remain open for public access.
263-1	**Comment:** *I strongly disagree with the closings that you are proposing. I feel you are denying the public their rights t o use this public land in the manner that it has been used in the past. I urge you to reconsider your trail closings*. **Response:** The Forest Service has identified unmanaged recreation, particularly the unmanaged use of OHVs as one of the four threats facing National Forests and Grasslands today. OHVs are a legitimate use of the National Forest System; however, this use should be managed carefully to ensure protection of other resources such as impacts to soil, water, wildlife habitat, and other recreational visitors. The intent of the proposed changes in OHV management on National Forests is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. These changes also allow for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. The Travel Management Rule requires each National Forest to designate roads, trails, and areas that are open to public motor vehicle use. The process of identification of roads that meet these needs is outlined in this project's Environmental Assessment (EA), and results in a road system that is (1) safe and responsive to public needs and desires, (2) affordable and efficiently managed, (3) has minimal negative ecological effect on the land, and (4) is in balance with available funding for needed management actions. Many people like yourself expressed an opinion in clear support of, or opposition to, one of the alternatives considered in the EA. Each alternative reflects a compromise between recreational use and resource protection. We read each of your comments and took them into consideration in our decision. We believe the selection of Alternative 3 (as modified) best meets your needs by

	providing a network of roads and trails that is accessible and sustainable. We believe this alternative better addresses the need for access than Alternative2, because it provides more opportunities for access where access can be sustained. It also allows for increased access during the fall hunting season while balancing the need for non-motorized use. Choosing Alternative 1 at this time would be irresponsible. If we choose to do nothing and allow the current motor vehicle use to occur unmanaged, we believe that your enjoyment of the National Forest will decrease while the environmental impacts would likely increase. Designating roads for motorized use without site-specific information and validation may have unintended consequences. Alternative 3 (as modified) provides a more appropriate process for reviewing and designating additional roads not yet considered (unauthorized roads). Putting all the unauthorized roads that have not been evaluated onsite on the map may lead to increased environmental damage that in some cases could be irreversible. Please see the Decision Notice for a full description of our decision and rationale. The use of the adaptive management process will allow us to continue to evaluate unauthorized roads that have not yet been brought to our attention or to address other areas of concern. We encourage you to continue working with state and local governments on meeting your recreational needs and to submit road-specific comments to us for consideration in future updates to the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of our adaptive management process.
264-1	**Comment:** *I'm responding to the proposed closure of forest roads in the Chequamegon-Nicolet NF. My wife and I are avid hunters, snowmobilers, hikers, campers, and ATVers. We strongly oppose any closure of forest roads, trails, or corridors. The forest is owned by citizens of the United States for all persons to use not just the would be environmentalists and activists. Any person that will be restricted from using our National Forest will be strongly opposed to this proposal. We are also the taxpayers that pay for your salary and for the forest itself. I will also be letting as many people I know about this very unpopular proposal. I feel we the people of the United states of America need to stop this now for us and our children, so we can all enjoy access to as much of our national forests as possible, motorized or not*. **Response:** Please see response to comment 263-1.
265-1	**Comment:** *The best of the best ranger, Matt Sherell, stated that FR 1285 is a 2.5 gravel road to my cabin from FR167 (ATV approved) is a federal road and ATV usage is prohibited. Yet, maintained by the township. So, requesting ATV usage on FR1285 Shanagolden - possibly written approval from you until the federal ordinance is in place. Certainly my grandsons and myself would travel north more often if FR 1285 was ATV approved***.** **Response:** FR 1287 is a town road and considered outside the scope of the project. Local Towns where the roads are located have the authority to designate mixed motorized use on these roads. Please refer to the Town of Shanagolden ordinance regarding ATV use on this road.
265-2	**Comment:** *Attached vicinity map of FR1285.*

	Response: Thank you for the helpful information.
265-3	**Comment:** *Attached copy of an ordinance from the Town of Shanagolden designating all town roads ATV and snowmobile routes*. **Response:** Thank you for the helpful information.
266-1	**Comment:** *All numbered and/or lettered roads open for ATV use!* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concern. We believe our decision provides for a sustainable and accessible network of roads and trails for motorized use. Please let us know specifically what road this is and we will consider it in our next update to the MVUM. The process of submission of roads for future use is outlined on page 9 of the EA and in Appendix B of the Decision Notice. We encourage your participation in this process which allows for public suggestions to be submitted continually to either add or remove specific roads or trails to the designated network. It is important to us that you be able to continue to use the Forest.
267-1	**Comment:** *We are mainly concerned that the woods road to the Elvin Busjahn property in the SW of Section 17, Shannagolden Township, be kept open for reasons stated before (attached earlier letter sent in October 2007 - letter #44). We are mainly concerned with Forest Roads 1276 and 866, which the road assessment report seems to recommend keeping open. We urge you to agree with that, and to also include the present "unrecognized" extension of Road 1276, which leads to the Busjahn 80 acres, to become a permanent part of Road 1276. Without it, they could not get to their land, which is in the Wisconsin Managed Forest Land agreement, and they have to perform certain regular management practices according to their DNR approved forestry plan*. **Response:** It was later determined that the route the Mr. Busjahn actually uses to access his property is FR866 off of GG to the unnumbered, unauthorized road going south off of 866 to his property. Mr. Busjahn understands that FR866 off of GG crosses private land. He has never had a problem using it and will contact the private landowner. The decision includes the designation of highway-legal use on both the portion of 866 on Forest Service land, west of the private parcel and on the unnumbered road going south into Mr. Busjahn's property.
267-2	**Comment:** *Attached a copy of letter #44, submitted during the last comment period*. **Response:** Letter 44 from the last comment period addresses the same road going south off of FR866 to the Busjahn property. Please see response to comment 267-1.
267-3	**Comment:** *Attached a copy of a vicinity map of road 1276***.** **Response:** Thank you for the helpful information.

268-1	**Comment:** *There was a news article in the LaCrosse Tribune, a copy of which I have enclosed, that says that there will be a drastic reduction in motorized access to the national forests in northern Wisconsin. My family greatly enjoys ATVing. ATVing is a very worthwhile and enjoyable activity. My family's experience is that public lands are very much under utilized for public recreational activities. ATVing is becoming more and more popular. This is a form of recreation that is affordable to working people. You don't have to be rich to participate in ATVing. I don't think that ATVing takes up very much of the total recreation possibilities in our national forests. The recreation possibilities in our national forest belong to each and every one of us. It seems to me that unreasonable environmental purists are constantly demanding reduced activity on our public lands. I think that is selfish and small-minded. Snowmobiling and ATVing are a growing and positive outdoor activity that is enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of people in Wisconsin. I doubt that there's any valid reason for drastically reducing ATV activity in our national forests. Those activities are already limited to established trails. My family would be very much opposed to the proposed ATV restrictions on motorized access to the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forests in Wisconsin.* **Response:** There is no significant change in ATV opportunities with this decision.
269-1	**Comment***: We own 80 acres in Ashland County, Shanagolden TWP - SW Sec. 17, we get to our land by turning off of County Road GG in to either forest road 866 or 1276. Where roads 866 and 1276 intersect there is a road that looks like an extension of 1276. This road goes to our timber roads. On the map enclosed this road is color coded as unauthorized. If this road is not closed we can not get to our land and want the right to appeal. We have used road 866 and the road that looks like an extension of 1276 for over 42 years. Please make it highway legal*. **Response:** The decision includes the designation of highway-legal use on both the portion of 866 on Forest Service land, west of the private parcel and on the unnumbered road going south into your property.
269-2	**Comment:** *Attached vicinity map of roads mentioned in this letters comments*. **Response:** Thank you for the helpful information.
270-1	**Comment:** *This is in regards of the road closure for the Forest. The road closing is a great idea but to block off camping spots within a 100 yards of the Maun Road is not. Please let these camping areas remain open. No one wants to see parked cars and trucks on the roadway plus the safety end of it, too. Please let the people have a place to park and camp a short ways off of main forest roads. Thank you*. **Response:** Parking along road rights-of-way, while legal, can be somewhat dangerous. We recommend the user park off of the road with enough distance to not impede other drivers' line of sight. Many user-created dispersed camping areas fall within legal parking distances from road ways. Campsites that do not fall within legal parking distances will still be available for public use. The difference being that they will only be accessible by non-motorized means only. Any roads needed to access dispersed campsites that were not brought forth in the recent TMR comments can be brought forth and possibly added to the 2010 MVUM.
271-1	**Comment:** *I read about the closing of another 55 percent of the existing roads on the Chequamegon-Nicolet NF. I'm a senior*

	citizen that has been driving on these roads for 45 years, hunting, fishing, and trapping. A lot of it will no longer be available to me (the forest) as I'm not in the shape I was in earlier years. I can't drag out a buck two miles back in the forest like I used to, or get a canoe back into trout fish. I don't think it's fair closing so many roads. The forest belongs to us to use also, not just the Forest Service. **Response:** Thank you for your comment and concern. The Forest Service welcomes all people, including individuals who have disabilities, to the National Forests and Grasslands. Outdoor recreation is about individual choice, including the type of recreation opportunity and the type of access. We can help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We also can direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences: easy access and the sense of remoteness. We are committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking. In this project, the Travel Management Project, we are designating National Forest System roads and trails for motor vehicle use as directed by the National Travel Management Rule. The motor vehicle use designation decisions are made through a planning process with public participation that evaluates current and potential impacts due to the operation of specific vehicle types on natural and cultural resources, public safety, recreation opportunities, conflict among uses and access needs. Individuals who use a wheelchair to aid in mobility are permitted to take that device anywhere foot traffic is allowed, including in designated wilderness. A wheelchair is defined according to 36 CFR 212.2, Forest Service Manual 2350.5 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Title V, Section 507(c) as any device, including one that is battery-powered, that is designed solely for use by a mobility-impaired person for locomotion, and that is suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area. We encourage anyone with disabilities or restricted ability to contact us to discuss the type of experience they are seeking (such as fishing and dispersed camping) and their means of access and we will help them locate an area that best suits their recreational needs. Your ability to use the Forest is important to us. We encourage you to stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). The more specific you can be the better we can address your needs. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
272-1	**Comment***: I do not agree in restricting vehicle access to the forest but fully support granting additional access, particularly for ATV usage. Given the three alternatives, if I understand the document you sent correctly, alternative three provides additional miles of ATV trails. I would encourage you to aggressively pursue opening up more public ATV access to our forests, including the current snowmobile trails.* **Response:** Our decision, which is Alternative 3 as modified and as described in the Decision Notice, includes 2,363 total miles of road available for public motor vehicle use (HLVs and ATVs). This decision also designated 334 miles of trails to be available for public ATV use. We look forward to working with you and others to incorporate future opportunities to modify the annual MVUM. Any information you wish to share with us will be welcome at any time. The more specific you can be in describing your needs and why, the better we can address them.

273-1	**Comment:** *In favor of Alt. 1, no action, as this alternative is best for multiple use of the forest.* **Response:** The Forest Service has identified unmanaged recreation, particularly the unmanaged use of OHVs as one of the four threats facing National Forests and Grasslands today. OHVs are a legitimate use of the National Forest System; however, this use should be managed carefully to ensure protection of other resources such as impacts to soil, water, wildlife habitat, and other recreational visitors. The intent of the proposed changes in OHV management on National Forests is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. These changes also allow for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. The Travel Management Rule requires each National Forest to designate roads, trails, and areas that are open to public motor vehicle use. The process of identification of roads that meet these needs is outlined in this project's Environmental Assessment (EA), and results in a road system that is (1) safe and responsive to public needs and desires, (2) affordable and efficiently managed, (3) has minimal negative ecological effect on the land, and (4) is in balance with available funding for needed management actions. Many people like yourself expressed an opinion in clear support of, or opposition to, one of the alternatives considered in the EA. Each alternative reflects a compromise between recreational use and resource protection. We read each of your comments and took them into consideration in our decision. We believe the selection of Alternative 3 (as modified) best meets your needs by providing a network of roads and trails that is accessible and sustainable. We believe this alternative better addresses the need for access than Alternative2, because it provides more opportunities for access where access can be sustained. It also allows for increased access during the fall hunting season while balancing the need for non-motorized use. Choosing Alternative 1 at this time would be irresponsible. If we choose to do nothing and allow the current motor vehicle use to occur unmanaged, we believe that your enjoyment of the National Forest will decrease while the environmental impacts would likely increase. Designating roads for motorized use without site-specific information and validation may have unintended consequences. Alternative 3 (as modified) provides a more appropriate process for reviewing and designating additional roads not yet considered (unauthorized roads). Putting all the unauthorized roads that have not been evaluated onsite on the map may lead to increased environmental damage that in some cases could be irreversible. Please see the Decision Notice for a full description of our decision and rationale. The use of the adaptive management process will allow us to continue to evaluate unauthorized roads that have not yet been brought to our attention or to address other areas of concern. We encourage you to continue working with state and local governments on meeting your recreational needs and to submit road-specific comments to us for consideration in future updates to the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for this process.
273-2	**Comment:** Business relies on Forest roads. Shutting off road may hurt his business. **Response:** Please let us know if there are specific roads you are concerns about. We will evaluate any roads you are concerned with.

273-3	**Comment:** *Would like to see 204D open and a spur off of 622E (not w#) open. Both roads provide access to creeks. The spur off of 622E is the first spur to the left.* **Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. FR 204D is identified for hlv in the selected alternative due to public value associated with the road. W223364 is identified for hlv in the selected alternative due to public value associated with the road.
274-1	**Comment:** *I am part owner of a cabin on the northeast end of Kentuck Lake on the forest road that goes past Kentuck Lake boat landing. I am concerned about road closures north of Kentuck Lake landing and southeast of Secret Lake. These roads, most of which are old railroad grades, are the only access that my family, deer hunters, bear hunters, partridge hunters and wildlife viewers have to that area. My father who is 86 years old, myself, relatives who have bad and replaced hips along with other forest users would not be able to use this area as we have for the past 40 to 50 plus years. Please allow us access to these areas. The older generation needs it.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concern. We believe our decision provides for a sustainable and accessible network of roads and trails for motorized use. Please let us know specifically which roads are important to your use of the Forest and we will consider them in our next update to the MVUM. The process of submission of roads for future use is outlined on page 9 of the EA and in Appendix B of the Decision Notice. We encourage your participation in this process which allows for public suggestions to be submitted continually to either add or remove specific roads or trails to the designated network. It is important to us that you be able to continue to use the Forest.
277-1	**Comment:** *Alan called saying he was opposed to closing gravel roads.* **Response:** The gravel roads you are referring to are most likely town roads. Town roads are under the jurisdiction of the towns and they determine the motorized use. These roads are unaffected by this project.
278-1	**Comment:** *Chick wants FR 2988C closed to motorized use so he can use for bicycle use. The road is located adjacent to his property. Chick stated that he was a disable vet.* **Response:** FR 2988C has been designated for no motorized use in the selected alternative.
279-1	**Comment:** *Alternative 1. I noticed this includes many roads which have previously been slated to be decommissioned. Which is something that I've previously commented on and have been assured will happen. Specifically Road number 94423, which borders private property (3 home different home owners), which could be between Campground Drive and Dommel. I have been assured this road will be decommissioned and taken off the maps.* **Response:** Roads that have been identified for decommissioning and included in project scale decisions other than TMR will in fact be decommissioned, based on those decisions. Please understand that it does take some time to implement decommissioning. This road has been designated for decommissioning in the Boulder EIS.

279-2	**Comment:** *Alternative 2. The only item I noticed was road 93722 was marked non-motorized. If this is a two track road (not a hiking trail) I ask that bicycles be allowed to traverse it. Prior to last year's tornado we were able to ride our bicycles from Boulder Lake Campground to Boot Lake Campground using logging roads and the newly constructed Roche Mountain Bile trail. I am not sure if road 93722 was a road we used. One goal of the Roche trail was to be able to ride bicycles between the two campgrounds. Please ensure a road is left available to bicycles (or to eliminate confusion, specifically include bicycles as a non-motorized vehicle suitable for this road).* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We appreciate your interest in using your bicycle in the Forest. Bicycles are allowed on any road or trail including non-motorized areas. However, they are not allowed in wilderness areas.
279-3	**Comment:** *Alternative 3. I do like all the highway legal only designations (I've seen too many modified vehicles tearing up the logging road into mud holes). The ATV area east of T and South of 64 I am against. It most likely will serve as a jumping off point for ATVs to drive through the rest of the tornado damaged area. That area is right in, or next to the tornado damage and there will not be any way to stop ATVs traveling any which way. Depending on the Season it will become a huge mess of dust or mud and hinder the regeneration of the Forest.* **Response:** We agree the tornado area will be inviting to ATV users who choose not to abide by the rules of using the ATV on designated routes and trails only. Fortunately, most people abide by the rules and will stay on designated routes and trails. If an area becomes a trouble spot for ATV use, then we can increase the law enforcement presence in those areas. To our knowledge, where existing routes and trails cross through the tornado area, there has not been an increase of ATV use there.
284-1	**Comment:** *I applaud National Forest planners and you as Forest Supervisor on the wisdom of your long term plan to protect the ecosystems in our northern forest by closing 55% of the forest to motorized traffic. Where is the greater need for people and all life - more roads or healthy ecosystems?* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective.
284-2	**Comment:** *Remote areas in the forest act as a sanctuary for native species which support healthy ecosystems that clean our water and air, maintain soil fertility, resist invasive species and help slow climate change. Remote areas reconnect people of all ages to the sounds, smells and beauty of wild nature. Remote areas offer biologists a place to learn how natural systems operate before human alteration and degradation. In short, remote areas, without motorized access, are the best way to preserve our life support system. The services provided by a healthy forest are priceless*. **Response:** Thank you for your comments.
284-3	**Comment:** *Everywhere wild nature is fast disappearing by being converted to a more motorized, more artificial landscape. Two thirds of Wisconsin's population now lives in cities. Everywhere people experience an excess of motor noise. Most people vacation and settle in our northwoods because large areas of public land still offer a somewhat wilderness experience. Healthy, outdoor exercise is no longer a suggestion but a preferred treatment for cardiac, cancer, and depressed patients, as well as a*

	stress reliever for the healthy. **Response:** Thank you for your comments.
284-4	**Comment:** *The majority of true hunters understand that habitat must be protected if they wish to hunt deer, elk, grouse, turkey, ducks and geese. A healthy forest maintains the health of lake and river ecosystems that are vital to our fisheries. Our state and national forest already provide extensive road access to most lakes and hunting areas*. **Response:** We believe this decision provide a balance of sustainable motorized and non-motorized access..
284-5	**Comment:** *Please reserve trails for silent sport users and nature enthusiasts. They comprise 85% of public land users according to the DNR SCORP report and are not compatible with motor users. Please strengthen the current "Green" movement. The Wisconsin Department of Tourism is promoting "Travel Green" and the Great Wisconsin Birding Tour. "Green" building is now affordable and fashionable and cities like Ashland have adopted "The Natural Step" concept to build their economy by conserving natural resources.* **Response:** We recognize ATV use as a legitimate use of National Forest System lands under direction mandated by the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960. However, we also recognize the potential for conflicts between users and the restrictions imposed in certain areas to protect natural resources and primitive and semi-primitive recreation make the issue of ATV access extremely difficult to resolve. We strive to minimize the potential for conflict by providing a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreational activities. This is in concert with the 2004 Forest Plan, which provides direction for a consistent, enforceable, Forest-wide policy that addresses the needs of ATV users, prevents unacceptable resource damage, and minimizes conflicts with other recreation activities.
284-6	**Comment:** *The majority of Wisconsin residents will support you now and for many generations if you keep your resolve to close 55% of the Chequamegon-Nicolet and protect a significant portion of our much endangered wild lands.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments.
285-1	**Comment:** *The closing of any miles of roads in the forest is absurd in my opinion. Limiting the access of National Forest land to the public goes against the ideal of providing the public with national forests in the first place. Please keep all forest roads open to vehicular traffic.* **Response:** The Forest Service has identified unmanaged recreation, particularly the unmanaged use of OHVs as one of the four threats facing National Forests and Grasslands today. OHVs are a legitimate use of the National Forest System; however, this use should be managed carefully to ensure protection of other resources such as impacts to soil, water, wildlife habitat, and other recreational visitors. The intent of the proposed changes in OHV management on National Forests is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. These changes also allow for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. The Travel Management Rule requires each National Forest to designate roads, trails, and areas that are open to

	public motor vehicle use. The process of identification of roads that meet these needs is outlined in this project's Environmental Assessment (EA), and results in a road system that is (1) safe and responsive to public needs and desires, (2) affordable and efficiently managed, (3) has minimal negative ecological effect on the land, and (4) is in balance with available funding for needed management actions. Many people like yourself expressed an opinion in clear support of, or opposition to, one of the alternatives considered in the EA. Each alternative reflects a compromise between recreational use and resource protection. We read each of your comments and took them into consideration in our decision. We believe the selection of Alternative 3 (as modified) best meets your needs by providing a network of roads and trails that is accessible and sustainable. We believe this alternative better addresses the need for access than Alternative2, because it provides more opportunities for access where access can be sustained. It also allows for increased access during the fall hunting season while balancing the need for non-motorized use. Choosing Alternative 1 at this time would be irresponsible. If we choose to do nothing and allow the current motor vehicle use to occur unmanaged, we believe that your enjoyment of the National Forest will decrease while the environmental impacts would likely increase. Designating roads for motorized use without site-specific information and validation may have unintended consequences. Alternative 3 (as modified) provides a more appropriate process for reviewing and designating additional roads not yet considered (unauthorized roads). Putting all the unauthorized roads that have not been evaluated onsite on the map may lead to increased environmental damage that in some cases could be irreversible. Please see the Decision Notice for a full description of our decision and rationale. The use of the adaptive management process will allow us to continue to evaluate unauthorized roads that have not yet been brought to our attention or to address other areas of concern. We encourage you to continue working with state and local governments on meeting your recreational needs and to submit road-specific comments to us for consideration in future updates to the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of our adaptive management process.
287-1	**Comment:** *This is a public land and should be available for public use. There are very few people who have the physical attributes to access 2080 acres of land on foot with gear and essentially this closes it to deer hunters who would have no possible way to remove a fallen deer. In addition, it closes the forest to elderly and handicapped people who may use the forest for hunting, photography, nature/bird watching. Is there some way to allow access via an ATV on a main road with hiking into other areas allowed for hunting etc. Since this is "public land" I see no reason that some access cannot be allowed for the nature and hunting enthusiasts who pay the taxes to enjoy what they are funding. I think if you have 2,080 of 4,657 closed off due to erosion, you can find one area for a main road that will not have an effect on the wetlands so that taxpayers may access public property within their rights. Since it is hunters and state park passes that pay for most of the environmental costs for the state of Wisconsin, I see no reason to close it the people who fund it. I hate to tell you, but it mountain bikers favor the plan, great, they're not paying for it!* **Response:** Thank your for your comment and concern. The Forest Service welcomes all people, including individuals who have

	disabilities, to the National Forests and Grasslands. Outdoor recreation is about individual choice, including the type of recreation opportunity and the type of access. We can help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We also can direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences: easy access and the sense of remoteness. We are committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking. In this project, the Travel Management Project, we are designating National Forest System roads and trails for motor vehicle use as directed by the National Travel Management Rule. The motor vehicle use designation decisions are made through a planning process with public participation that evaluates current and potential impacts due to the operation of specific vehicle types on natural and cultural resources, public safety, recreation opportunities, conflict among uses and access needs. Individuals who use a wheelchair to aid in mobility are permitted to take that device anywhere foot traffic is allowed, including in designated wilderness. A wheelchair is defined according to 36 CFR 212.2, Forest Service Manual 2350.5 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Title V, Section 507(c) as any device, including one that is battery-powered, that is designed solely for use by a mobility-impaired person for locomotion, and that is suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area. We encourage anyone with disabilities or restricted ability to contact us to discuss the type of experience they are seeking (such as fishing and dispersed camping) and their means of access and we will help them locate an area that best suits their recreational needs. Your ability to use the Forest is important to us. We encourage you to stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). The more specific you can be the better we can address your needs. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
288-1	**Comment:** *My family and I are avid off road motorcycle enthusiasts. We are users of your forest area and believe that the current access to land users like us is too limited. We request that you consider expanding the number of off road motorcycle trails in your forest and do not act to restrict access to other user groups. Land use rights should be equal for all types of users and regulations should not be written based solely on input from environmental extremists*. **Response:** Thank you for your involvement with this project. While constructing new motorcycle trails is not a specific part of this project, the development of additional trails, loops, or connectors would be a part of site-specific project analysis at the Ranger District where a proposal would be located. The 2004 Land and Resource Forest Plan objectives include construction of additional ATV motorized trails. Motorcycles, less than 900 pounds, are considered as ATVs. Input on potential trails should be directed to the local District Ranger.
289-1	**Comment***: I am writing in complete support of the travel mgt. plan regarding ATV travel and use in the Chequamegon-Nicolet NF. I am an avid, 66 yr old hunter, who spends two weeks each Oct in the Park Falls, WI. area hunting grouse and woodcock. The use of the ATV has reached a critical level on all public land, and especially in the forest land in Price and surrounding counties. Hunting grouse from the ATV is out of hand. Each small two track logging road that we come across is trampled and chewed up by ATV tracks and ruts. The bird hunting limits and seasons were set with the expectation of foot hunting. The ATV use allows a person to travel literally, 20 to 30 miles in a day, shooting birds in or near the road. Please stick to your very*

	intelligent and progressive management plan of reducing and limiting the ATV usage in the C-N National Forest. Thank you. **Response:** Thank you for your comments and sharing your experiences on the Forest.
290-1	**Comment:** *I am in full support of the U.S. Forest Service preferred option for the Travel Management Project. Some of the proposed road closures are in areas that I frequently visit. These roads are not maintained and use of these roads by motorized vehicles have resulted in severe erosion and have created conditions for invasive species. I tend to spend more time in the designated non-motorized vehicle areas like the Jones Springs Area. These areas should stay non-motorized and I am in full support of closing additional roads.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. This specific information was helpful for us to evaluate resource risks against public values for specific roads. Please refer to the Soil Resources and Non-native Invasive Species reports to read how we accounted for soil erosion and invasive species.
290-2	**Comment:** *I am in disagreement with the Wisconsin Conservation Congress views that this preferred alternative will hinder access of less fit individuals. There are many areas in the Forest that have roads open to motorized vehicles with your preferred alternative.* **Response:** We appreciate your perspective. We have heard from many people who support our proposal. With this decision, we have attempted to balance all perspectives to provide access while also accounting for resource protection.
290-3	**Comment:** *Having fewer roads open to motorized access will improve wildlife viewing, hunting, trapping, and fishing. You have done a great job in your analysis and with the selection of the preferred alternative*. **Response:** Thank you for your comments. People's use of the National Forest was an important consideration for us (please refer to page 27 of the Decision Notice for the public values and resource risks we considered). We strived for a balance to provide access for the uses mentioned here, whether it be by motor vehicles or other non-motorized means.
291-1	**Comment:** *I am opposed to closing any roads in the Nicolet National Forest. The forest already has enough isolated areas for hiking and cross country skiing. Closing roads would only lessen the quality of the experience there by forcing more people into the same area. Being able to spread out and be along is what people want there. Please keep the roads open*. **Response:** Thank you for your comments. Maintaining such a large and dispersed network of roads and trails (as described in Alternative 1) would likely lead to unintended consequences. The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We believe this still avoids forcing people into the same area. Please see response to comment 181-3 for further explanation on why Alternative 1 was not chosen.
292-1	**Comment:** *If reduction will save wear and tear on the forest that's a good thing. I'm sure that silent sport people will highly appreciate this move. Silent sport people are few in numbers and have a reputation of having powerful influence on*

	environmental issues, but alas they are notoriously poor at leaving a little money in our local economy. **Response:** We examined the available information from the State of Wisconsin to determine what economic effects would result from our decision (see Recreation Report; also, please see the State of Wisconsin SCORP for extensive information on the economic contributions to Wisconsin's economy from non-motorized recreation and tourism. We did not discover definitive conclusions on whether motor vehicle users influence local economies more or less than people who participate in "silent sports." However, we did receive a large number of comments from people who support having areas of the National Forest with no motor vehicle use. This was an important perspective for us to consider when deciding whether a road or trail should be available for motor vehicle use.
292-2	**Comment:** *If reduction of roads will save on rutted up forest floor. I would add that the government is the single most destructive forest floor entity. The majority of rutted environment since the 1930s has been the government. I challenge anyone to try to hike across the federal tracts where good forestry practices have been in effect for the last 70 years*. **Response:** We are addressing the growing number of users of this National Forest and in particular, those people who use motor vehicles to enjoy it. We recognize that using motor vehicles on the National Forest is a legitimate use. We are striving to provide ample access for people's enjoyment while also limiting the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. Please also see response to comment 181-3 to understand our focus for making this decision.
292-3	**Comment:** *It is my observation that peoples that have five generations living on the edge of the forest are better stewards than you think. They know the roads by their names not their numbers. Young academics coming out of the universities are wonderful at the biology of growing a forest. But they lack the knowledge to grown a small town economy.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We appreciate the interest that multiple generations have in this National Forest. We used this perspective to help us understand how to manage motor vehicle access today for the continued enjoyment of future generations. It is also this specific information we want people to share with us so we can effectively evaluate whether to designate a road or trail for motor vehicle use. We strongly encourage people to continually engage us and share their perspectives about access to the National Forest with us.
293-1	**Comment:** *I am very much against this Travel Management Plan that has been brought about, it would close off needed road travel for all types of recreation by all types of people of whom pay for these lands in the first place and are for public use.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 181-3 for further explanation on why this is a necessary decision for us to make regarding how people use motor vehicles on the National Forest.
311-1	**Comment:** *Randall read about TMR in the newspaper, so stopped in to cast his vote for not reducing motorized access to the forest. He has used the forest roads for most of his life to access areas he hunts in. He said even short spur roads provide valuable access to the national forest.* **Response:** We appreciate the specific information he provided to us. Our decision includes an adaptive management

	component that allows people to continually submit specific road or trail information to us as we continually update the MVUM. Please see response to comment 181-3 for further explanation on why this is a necessary decision for us to make regarding how people use motor vehicles on the National Forest.
312-1	**Comment:** *Dick has seen firsthand the damage ATV's cause to elk habitat off trail. A foraging area behind a gate that had recently been seeded was heavily impacted by ATV's last year. He spends time with Laign and Matt from the WDNR on wildlife projects. He is in favor of Alts. 2 and 3- for elk protection.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments and your interest in the elk herd. We specifically considered motor vehicle disturbance on elk when evaluating roads and trails on the Great Divide Ranger District.
313-1	**Comment:** *I have just started hunting the Clam Lake area and would like to know where I can use the ATV.* **Response:** Our designated network of roads and trails that are available to public motorized use, including ATVs, is described in the Decision Notice for this project. Our designated network will be displayed on a motor vehicle use map (MVUM), scheduled to be published January 2009. The MVUM will only display those Forest Service roads and trails available for public motor vehicle use. We recommend that people also check with other jurisdictions (towns and counties) for available ATV use in the Clam Lake area. This map will be updated annually and will be available free at all Forest offices and on the CNNF website at http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/cnnf/rec/tmr/index.html
314-1	**Comment:** *Gregg called to ask that we leave as many roads open as possible, as he wants continued motorized access to various roads on the National Forest. He couldn't name any specifically, but noted that he likes to explore different areas of the forest. He wants to have wide access to the National Forest.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 181-3 for further explanation on why this is a necessary decision for us to make regarding how people use motor vehicles on the National Forest.
314-2	**Comment:** *He doesn't want to see the Forest Service spending money and time putting in closures and writing tickets when the closures aren't needed in the first place. Is there really a problem? What is it? Don't create more rules and fines unnecessarily.* **Response:** The intent of our decision is to provide sustainable opportunities for public motor vehicle use while also protecting the resources that people want to use. With the increases in population and motor vehicle use, we can no longer allow motor vehicle use to occur in an unmanaged condition. Please see response to comment 181-3 for further explanation of why we are addressing this use of the National Forest.
314-3	**Comment:** *Reducing motorized access to the Forest may cause less people to visit the forest. We need people to visit the forest so that they are aware of how important natural resources are to the nation; the world*. **Response:** We acknowledge that ATV use is increasing in Wisconsin (see Recreation report for SCORP and other data supporting this conclusion). However, we have not found a definitive conclusion that reducing motorized use will result in a

	decrease in people visiting the National Forest. Our decision balances providing access for people's enjoyment while also minimizing the environmental impacts from their use of motor vehicles.
314-4	**Comment:** *Reducing access will create an unnecessary burden on law enforcement officials. They will be spending needless time and money on TMR when they could be spending their time making a much more positive contribution to society (including the local forest community) elsewhere.* **Response:** We recognize that reducing access to some areas of the National Forest may aid in enforcement issues relating to off road violations. However, our law enforcement officials will focus on education and the proper use of the MVUM during the map's first year. They will also help people understand that they can continually provide specific information on roads and trails for future MVUM updates.
314-5	**Comment***: All people need to have an opportunity to access ALL parts of the National Forest via the method they choose (including motorized used).* **Response:** We are addressing the growing number of users of this National Forest and in particular, those people who use motor vehicles to enjoy the National Forest. We recognize that using motor vehicles on the National Forest is a legitimate use. We are striving to provide ample access for people's enjoyment while also limiting the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. Please see comment 181-3 for further explanations on why we are making this decision.
315-1	**Comment:** *James is a partially disabled hunter and needs access to roads for hunting. He supports Alternative 1. I asked him if there are specific roads he uses. He said he uses the Forest Service roads in Bayfield and Sawyer Counties that are south of Lakewoods Resort and the roads off of the Chippewa Lake Road.* **Response:** Thank you for the specific comments on the roads that provide you the access you desire. Please see response to comment 180-1 for further explanation on how we addressed, and will continue to address, people with disabilities and their desire to use the National Forest.
316-1	**Comment:** *John lives in the Moose Lake area and has a radio show about the outdoors. He is very familiar with the roads in the Moose Lake area. He said folks who hunt and fish rely on motorized access via the types of roads we are closing. Also, there are many roads that exist on the ground that aren't showing up on our maps. One example is that FR 1644 and 714 (east of County Hwy. S) connect on the ground, but the part of the road in the middle running west to east isn't on the maps. It's a well used road-Berg had it put in to access his property at one time.* **Response:** The Forest acknowledges that there are roads on the landscape that are not currently inventoried. Inventories are gradually and continually being updated at the project scale across the Forest. The road specifically mentioned by the commenter is a snowmobile trail (FT 421) that was used for short term access under a special use permit. Evaluation and consideration will be given to this road for long term and public need.

316-2	**Comment:** *Don't reduce motorized access to the forest, as it is an important aspect of tourism in the Hayward lakes area.* **Response:** We value the way people use the National Forest and their ability to access the Forest. Tourism is one of the items we used to evaluate the public value associated with specific roads and trails. Please refer to page 27 of the Decision Notice for an explanation how access for recreation activities was used in our evaluations.
316-3	**Comment:** *John felt roads should be open to allow more access especially for hunting. Older people are not as able to get around by foot. In addition, fewer roads concentrate hunters into smaller areas instead of allowing for dispersion.* **Response:** Maintaining such a large and dispersed network of roads and trails (as described in Alternative 1) would likely lead to unintended consequences. The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We believe this avoids forcing people into smaller areas. Please see response to comment 180-1 for further explanation on how we addressed, and will continue to address, people with disabilities and their desire to use the National Forest.
316-4	**Comment:** *He was concerned that many of the roads with current ATV signs would be closed.* **Response:** ATV access remains mostly unchanged with our decision. Our decision actually adds roads for ATV use, particularly on the east side of the Forest (see page 2 of the Decision Notice).
316-5	**Comment:** *He thought Buffalo Lake access should be open.* **Response:** FR 1742 is currently open to both hlv and atv. Additional roads (W224310, W224311) providing access to Buffalo Lake and Hadley Lake are identified for hlv and atv in the selected alternative due to high public values and low resource risks associated with the roads.
316-6	**Comment:** *He didn't like the non-motorized areas*. **Response:** Thank you for your comments. Maintaining such a large and dispersed network of roads and trails (as described in Alternative 1) would likely lead to unintended consequences. One consequence would have been skewing access to the National Forest more towards people who use motor vehicles than those people who do not. The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice).
317-1	**Comment:** *Jim lives owns and operates a resort on Moose Lake. He is also president of the Hayward Lakes Visitor and Convention Bureau. He understands the opposing views regarding motorized access to the National Forest. He is concerned that reducing motorized access to places within the National Forest will have impacts on tourism in the Hayward Lakes area. Loss of motorized access to public lands could mean that tourists go elsewhere*. **Response:** We examined the available information from the State of Wisconsin to determine what economic effects would result

	from our decision (see Recreation Report; also, please see the State of Wisconsin SCORP for extensive information on the economic contributions to Wisconsin's economy from non-motorized recreation and tourism). We did not discover definitive conclusions on whether motor vehicle users influence local economies more or less than people who participate in “silent sports.” However, we did receive a large number of comments from people who support using motor vehicles to access areas of the National Forest. This was an important perspective for us to consider when deciding whether a road or trail should be available for motor vehicle use. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
317-2	**Comment:** *He has been to the website, and was having trouble viewing the maps when I talked to him*. **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We appreciate the feedback on how effective our website is for displaying information.
318-1	**Comment:** *Gerald has been spending time in the Chequamegon part of the CNNF for most of his 54 years. He is very familiar with the roads, as has driven many of them himself. He does not want to see any of the existing roads closed to public use. He feels they should all be left open to legal motorized use by the public. He feels that public use of the woods roads does not cause damage, and that any disturbance that does occur to these roads isn't hurting anything outside of the road corridor itself.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. Our EA documents the nature and importance of the physical, biological, social and economic effects of our decision. The EA not only analyzed the impacts to soils, but other resource areas including transportation planning, hydrology, threatened and endangered and sensitive species, wildlife, non-native invasive species, heritage resources, recreation, and social and economic resource areas. While many roads do not pose a risk to the environment, some do pose a high risk to further environmental damage. It is these “high risk” roads we want to specifically address as to whether it is appropriate to continue public motor vehicle use.
318-2	**Comment:** *He feels that logging causes much more damage than public use of roads and that is allowed; so it doesn't make sense to cut the public off from using these roads when they aren't causing damage. Logging and mining (in the past) also caused a lot of damage to forest roads.* **Response:** Thank you for this input. Specific information such as this helps us evaluate whether to designate roads and trails for public motor vehicle use. If the resource risks for a particular road are low, it is likely that we will designate that road for public motor vehicle use.
318-3	**Comment:** *Shutting off large tracks of land by closing roads results in the majority of the public no longer using those parts of the National Forest. Examples are the Brunsweiler semi-primitive non-motorized area and St. Peter's Dome management area on the north part of the District. Also the area east of Moose Lake that became designated as non-motorized under the 2004 Forest Plan.* **Response:** With this project, we have heard from many people that desire a non-motorized experience. These people do use the Forest and told us they seek areas where there are no motor vehicles. These comments helped us realize that the National Forest is used by a balance of users, not just those who use motor vehicles.

	Under the Forest Service Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) management system, the intent and purpose of semi-primitive non-motorized areas includes providing "solitude" and environments in which the sights and sounds of people are not common. Several management factors are used by the CNNF to meet the goals, including access. We have not found any information available to conclude that concentrating use on fewer roads will reduce motorized use overall.
318-4	**Comment:** *He understands that this is a National rule, but stated that there aren't real problems with roads in our area- in Wisconsin. There isn't much traffic on most of these roads for the majority of the year. Most of it occurs during the hunting seasons. The minor disturbance that does occur heals naturally*. **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. Our EA documents the nature and importance of the physical, biological, social and economic effects of our decision. The EA not only analyzed the impacts to soils, but other resource areas including transportation planning, hydrology, threatened and endangered and sensitive species, wildlife, non-native invasive species, heritage resources, recreation, and social and economic resource areas. While many roads do not pose a risk to the environment, some do pose a high risk to further environmental damage. It is these “high risk” roads we want to specifically address as to whether it is appropriate to continue public motor vehicle use.
318-5	**Comment:** *Keep the forests in Wisconsin open to ALL people. The elderly, disabled, obese, sick, and others who aren't able to walk are discriminated against when roads are closed.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 180-1 for further explanation on how we addressed, and will continue to address, people with disabilities and their desire to use the National Forest.
318-6	**Comment:** *He stated that we (the Forest Service) are creating a problem where none exists.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 181-3 to understand our focus for making this decision.
318-7	**Comment:** *He also stated that public notification of these closures/changes was inadequate. Many people are just hearing about this now.* **Response:** We acknowledge that people are learning of this project and decision for the first time. Public involvement has been a very important component in how we approached this project. We held 15 open houses in 2007 to solicit public input on specific roads. Ten open houses were held in January and February 2007, five for the public and five for governmental entities. Five open houses were held in October 2007 to present our initial proposal to the public and to solicit additional comments. The Decision Notice (pages 7-9) also describes the process the Forest Service used to inform and involve the public for this project. To accommodate people who are hearing about this decision for the first time, and those who have yet to hear about it, we will continually listen to people and accept specific information they have for roads and trails as we update the MVUM.
319-1	**Comment:** *Please make a good drivable access to Pelican Lake. 327C does go to the lake and will be closed per proposal.* **Response:** FR 327C is identified for hlv and atv in the selected alternative and will maintain lake access due to public value.

	W232433 is an extension of FR 327C and the ultimate access road to Pelican Lake via 327C. This road is also identified for hlv and atv in the selected alternative due to public value.
320-1	**Comment:** *Mike called to express his concern over the idea of reduced motorized access to the National Forest. He had read an article about it in the newspaper. He also called to "warn me" that many other people would be calling in to express their disagreement with closing any roads in the National Forest; as he sent a note out to about 400 people on his mailing address.* **Response:** We appreciate your interest in our project. We acknowledge that people are learning of this project and decision for the first time. Public involvement has been a very important component in how we approached this project. To accommodate people who are hearing about this decision for the first time, and those who have yet to hear about it, we will continually listen to people and accept specific information they have for roads and trails as we update the MVUM.
322-1	**Comment:** *Ed owns Winterwoods company out of Glidden. They rely on bough collectors and special forest product collectors to provide them with balsam, princess pine, sheet moss, and other non-traditional forest products for the production of wreaths and other Christmas decor. Closing roads will affect their business as well as the economy and well-being of the local people who make a living collecting these forest products. It is too difficult for people to carry forest products; collectors need to be able to use ATV's and vehicles on the woods roads to carry out the products they collect. Logging equipment does a lot more damage to roads than ATVs or vehicles. Leave the roads in the Forest open to ATVs at a minimum and vehicles when possible for collectors of forest products.* **Response:** We appreciate this perspective on the value of people accessing the National Forest. We encourage people to continually engage us to share specific information on roads and trails they use. This information will be valuable to us as we update the MVUM in future years. In our decision we added 71 miles of roads available to ATV use and 18 miles of trails available to ATVs. This is in addition to what is currently available. Please see Appendix A to this document for more information on the economic issue.
323-1	**Comment:** *George owns property in the vicinity of the Lake Three and Mineral Lake area with Phil Francis. They looked at the CD that Phil received, and discovered that many of the roads that they use to access the forest for hunting would be not be open under Alternatives 2 and 3. They and a number of their friends have been hunting in the Lake Three area for 30 years. One of the hunting methods they use is deer drives. The more elderly guys need those roads to access the areas they stand in during drives. They aren't able to walk that far in. The roads they are primarily concerned about are along Mineral Lake road and the Bayfield County Line road by Lake Three. These roads don't get much if any ATV use. They are used by highway legal vehicles to access areas for hunting. They are in good shape? have vegetation on them? are old logging roads. Some of the roads they use that would not be open are: 187E, 187A, W218232, W218357, W218356, W218346, W218341, W218361, W217201, W217125, W217122, W218401, and others. Most of these "W" roads branch off of other roads that would be open year round or seasonally.* **Response:** Thank you for this input. Specific information such as this helps us evaluate whether to designate roads and trails

	for public motor vehicle use. We reviewed each of these roads. The only roads that will allow motorized use are W218361 for hlv and W218401 for hlv, atv. This area is obviously important to you. Our decision provides for a continual review and update of the road system. We encourage you to meet with us and together we could visit these roads and better understand your desire to continue to use them and other roads in the area.
324-1	**Comment:** *Dave and Rod own Northstar Company, and landscaping and garden center. They rely on bough collectors to provide them with evergreen material for wreaths, centerpieces, swags, and other decorative fixings. Closing roads would hurt business if the collectors he relies on can't access the forest. They need to be able to use vehicles, because boughs are too cumbersome to carry any distance. Closing roads would not only hurt his business, but the economy of the whole area. Leave as many roads as possible open to bough collectors.* **Response:** We appreciate this perspective on the value of people accessing the National Forest. Please encourage your bough collectors and yourselves to continually engage us to share specific information on roads and trails used for bough collecting. This information will be valuable to us as we update the MVUM in future years. In our decision we added an additional 205 miles of roads and 18 miles of ATV trails. Please see Appendix A to this document for more details on the economic issue.
326-1	**Comment:** *Colleen and Greg own Neff's Northland Evergreens. They rely on bough collectors to provide them with balsam boughs for the production of wreaths and garland. Closing roads would hurt their business if the collectors they rely on can't access the forest. Collectors need to be able to use vehicles, because boughs are too cumbersome to carry any distance. Closing roads would not only hurt their business, but the economy of the whole area. Leave as many roads as possible open to bough collectors.* **Response:** We appreciate this perspective on the value of people accessing the National Forest. Please encourage your bough collectors and yourselves to continually engage us to share specific information on roads and trails used for bough collecting. This information will be valuable to us as we update the MVUM in future years. In our decision we added an additional 205 miles of roads and 18 miles of ATV trails. Please see Appendix A to this document for more details on the economic issue.
327-1	**Comment:** *I am writing to respectfully request that the comment period for the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest (CNNF) Travel Management Project (Federal Register No. 68264) be extended beyond the current closing date of August 18, 2008. I appreciate the efforts of the CNNF to publicize the dates of the 30-day comment period. However, because a number of my constituents will be hard-pressed to meet the current deadline, I ask that additional time be granted for them to submit comments. I thank you for your diligence in informing the public of this comment period, and ask that you provide an additional 30 days, beyond the August 18 deadline, in order to gather a complete and accurate record of local sentiment prior to the final rulemaking.* **Response:** By regulation (CFR 215.6), we cannot extend the comment period beyond 30 days, which ended August 18, 2008. However, we considered all comments received prior to making our decision. It is important to note that our decision includes an adaptive management process where we will accept comments on a continual basis. We are specifically accepting comments related to particular roads and trails people would like to see added or removed from the MVUM. This will be an on-going

	process. We are committed to continue working collaboratively with all interested parties. Finally, we encourage people to be as specific as possible when commenting and to recognize the map will be updated annually to incorporate comments we receive.
327-2	**Comment:** *Some of these people have raised concerns with me that the proposed rule will have a negative impact on forestry management and the local ability to combat fire, disease, and invasive species.* **Response:** Thank you for highlighting this concern with us. Our decision addresses motor vehicle use for the general public. This is distinctly different from motor vehicle use that is needed to manage the natural resources of the National Forest. We term this type of use as "administrative." These administrative uses are governed by contracts or agreements, and road access has been specifically identified in those authorizing documents. Given our decision's focus on general public use of motor vehicles, road access needed to manage the Forest, fight wildfires, address diseased areas, and control invasive species will not be affected.
327-3	**Comment***: Many are also concerned that this rule will eliminate a reasonable level of public access to recreational opportunities, reduce employment and cause a loss of local and state revenues.* **Response:** We examined the available information from the State of Wisconsin to determine what economic effects would result from our decision (see Recreation Report; also, please see the State of Wisconsin SCORP for extensive information on the economic contributions to Wisconsin's economy from non-motorized recreation and tourism). We did not discover definitive conclusions on whether a change in access opportunities for motor vehicles would result in a loss of local and State revenues.
328-1	**Comment:** *I would like to comment on the proposed Travel management Rule. I am an avid outdoorsman mainly participating in hunting and fishing and would like to comment on the proposed travel management rule and how it could potentially reduce fishing opportunities in the National Forest. For years I have fished numerous small remote lakes within the Chequamegon side of the forest. Most of these lakes are hard to locate and access for the average person. They often do not have woods roads coming to the waters edge and require that a small canoe or boat be drug by hand into them. For these reasons very few people fish them, for the people who care to do the required research to find a way into the lake and are ambitious enough to drag a boat for distances sometimes to mile mind that the fishing is excellent and the atmosphere tranquil. Many times you have the lake to yourself*. **Response:** Thank you for this input. We appreciate this perspective on the value of people accessing the National Forest. Specific information such as this helps us evaluate whether to designate roads and trails for public motor vehicle use.
328-2	**Comment:** *My first general comment is that any road or trail that leads up to a lake or comes near a lake I would like to see re-evaluated and hopefully opened to highway legal vehicles if the road is firm enough to support summer time traffic. My second comment is that I am not against non-motorized areas as long as it doesn't start to impact too much of the forest. I often fish the lakes in the Rock Lake non-motorized area. Several years ago that non-motorized area was expanded to include both Patsy and Wilson Lake, which could previously be accessed by truck. Now the long distance to the lake from the town road has virtually eliminated the possibility of any one being able to carry a boat into them to fish them. Dragging a boat any more than or at most*

	on a good trail is really pushing the practicality of fishing that lake for just one day. **Response:** Thank you for this input. We appreciate this perspective on the value of people accessing the National Forest. Specific information such as this helps us evaluate whether to designate roads and trails for public motor vehicle use.
328-3	**Comment:** *My point is if you're going to have non-motorized area with lakes in them make the distance from the road to the lake a practical distance that people can still justify both physically and timely dragging a boat into. If the distance is too far these lakes will not be enjoyed and opportunity is lost on a fixed resource.* **Response:** We appreciate this perspective on the value of people accessing the National Forest. Our non-motorized areas provide a certain type of experience, one where a user desires the challenge to access the area and its recreation opportunities, such as a fishing lake. With this project, we heard from many people who told us that this is exactly the type of experience they seek on the National Forest. Our decision balances the access needs of all users while also accommodating the experiences these users want from the National Forest.
328-4	**Comment:** *I would like to comment individually on 7 lakes that all have unauthorized roads to them. Ghost Lake has a very firm road going to it and one steep hill that has some minor erosion. This road is the only public access to Ghost Lake that is otherwise surrounded by private property. Closing this road to highway legal traffic is going to make a now public lake into a private lake because of lack of decent access. I would like to see this road open to seasonal (summer) highway legal access at a minimum. I would also like to see the following lakes open to a minimum season (summer) highway legal access. McCloud Lake, Christy Lake, Muskie Springs Lake, Buffalo Lake, Hadley Lake and McClaren Lake. Some of these lakes are vastly surrounded by private. A general comment regarding these lakes that have private property on them. If the current unauthorized road does not meet your standards for highway legal traffic then I would like to see those roads improved to accommodate highway legal traffic rather than having the road closed. I feel very strongly about having lakes that have potential or existing public vehicular access and have private ownership on them being closed to the general public creating in practicality a private lake.* **Response:** Thank you for this input. We appreciate this perspective on the value of people accessing the National Forest. Specific information such as this helps us evaluate whether to designate roads and trails for public motor vehicle use. Ghost Lake access (W223273, W223275) has been evaluated and is identified for hlv and atv in the selected alternative due to public value. The Forest Service does not have legal access by road to any points on McCloud Lake; therefore no consideration can be made for access to this lake. Motorized access to Christy Lake (FR 208C, W224340) has been identified for hlv in the selected alternative due to public value and low risk to resources. Motorized access to Musky Springs (FR 1742, W224311) has been identified for hlv and atv in the selected alternative due to public value and low risk to resources. Motorized access to Buffalo Lake and Hadley Lake (FR1742 and W224310) has been identified for hlv and atv in the selected alternative. Motorized access has been identified to McClaren Lake (1266A, W224239) for hlv in the selected alternative due to public value.
328-5	**Comment:** *Attached map displaying lakes for commenter letter no. 328*. **Response:** Thank you for this input. Specific information such as this helps us evaluate whether to designate roads and trails

	for public motor vehicle use.
329-1	**Comment:** *I think you really need to consider the impact on the available resources in these areas. In our society today it is difficult enough to keep people engaged in the out of doors. We have enough problems with crowding on forest lands. When you limit access you force more crowding.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We believe this still avoids forcing people into the same area. We will continually accept specific suggestions for additional road and trails as we update the MVUM. We strive to provide ample access for people so they enjoy the outdoors on the National Forest.
329-2	**Comment:** *The other concerns are personnel I do run hounds and limiting access puts my dogs at a greater risk to predation by wolves. I don't know if you understand the impact that wolves have already had on the hunting fraternity but it is significant. Looking at what is happening with our game populations such as Deer, Bear, and Turkeys with the growth they are continuing to have we need to insure a better ability to manage not a more difficult means to manage. It is a proven fact that the more difficult you make it to access the less success you will have in managing those resources*. **Response:** Thank you for this insight to bear hunting. Our decision strives to provide the access people need while also minimizing environmental impacts. We understand that a reduction in available roads is one of many factors that can influence hunter success (for deer, bear, grouse or turkey). However, our decision does not affect the hunting opportunity on the CNNF. With the exception of campgrounds and administrative sites, the vast majority of the CNNF will continue to be open to hunters. If there are roads that are not on the MVUM, people will continue to have opportunities to submit suggestions to us to add those roads for a map update.
329-3	**Comment:** *The concerns I also share is with the conflict from those requesting quiet sports and a general support by the forest service to this special interest group why can we not live and let live rather than creating a special use system for those people.* **Response:** We recognize ATV use as a legitimate use of National Forest System lands under direction mandated by the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960. However, we also recognize the potential for conflicts between users on the National Forest. Our decision strives to minimize the potential for conflict by providing a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreational activities. One reason we initiated this project is the recognition that the number of people using the National Forest has grown dramatically. In particular, ATV registrations in Wisconsin have increased four-fold in the past 10 years. This change has made it more difficult for us to provide an enjoyable experience for non-motorized users.
330-1	**Comment:** *I am in favor of Alternative 3 (Hunter, Trapper Use*). **Response:** Thank you for relaying your preference. Please see the Decision Notice for a description of our decision.

331-1	**Comment:** *I am against any more closing of roads in the forest as are being proposed*. **Response:** Thank you for your comments; please see response to comment 181-3 for further explanation on why this is a necessary decision for us to make regarding how people use motor vehicles on the National Forest.
331-2	**Comment:** *Creating more, remote and larger blocks of forest will only result in increased wolf populations which tend to restrict hiking and bird hunting. I say restrict, as I already do not hunt as far in as I used to because I fear for my dog. I realize so far Grouse dog attacks are essentially non-existent, but as an older hunter I am not as willing to take that risk as others might be, and w/more and more wolves, there simply will be less area to hunt away from them*. **Response:** We appreciate hearing your concerns for your dog. As you note, wolf/hunting dogs attacks are not prevalent at this time. However, bird hunters and their dogs may encounter wolves any of the low standard roads on the CNNF, whether those roads are open to motorized use or not. We encourage people to engage us with specific road suggestions for future map updates, especially for those hunting areas people would like to see accessible to motor vehicles.
331-3	**Comment:** *With less access, will that reduce or make it more difficult to issue logging contracts which in turn keep the forest young and regenerating which is good for all wildlife, including the wolves*. **Response:** We appreciate your question. Our decision addresses only motor vehicle use by the general public. Timber harvest activities are termed “administrative actions” (i.e., actions administered by the Forest Service) and are not affected by this decision. Access for these administrative actions will not change with our decision. Please see the wildlife report for additional information on how our decision affects wolves and other wildlife.
332-1	**Comment:** *Recently the United States Forest Service (USFS) unveiled a proposal to shut down 55% of the forest and logging roads on the Chequamegon/Nicolet National Forest (CNNF). I am writing to vigorously oppose this awful proposal. Once again the USFS has proven there are no limits to their obstruction of utilizing the national forests for logging, hunting and recreation.* **Response:** Thank you for this perspective. We manage the National Forest in a balanced combination to best meet the needs of the American people. This is one reason we chose to solicit specific road suggestions from people—to gain a better understanding of the access they need for their activities. Our decision provides ample access for people’s hunting and recreation needs. We also will continue to accept specific road suggestions from people for future map updates. Please see comment 331-3 for an explanation of how our decision does not affect logging, and comment 181-3 for an explanation why we are making this decision about public motor vehicle use.
332-2	**Comment:** *Throughout the 80's and 90's, the USFS strangled communities in the western United States by shutting down vast tracts of the western forests to logging and motorized vehicles. All over the west, communities that for generations had derived their economic existence by sustainably managing the western forestlands became a shell of their prior existence. Are we to suffer the same fate in northern Wisconsin? Through the course of this decade we are seeing radical environmental groups hire lawyers from various parts of the nation to shut down sale after sale of mature timber in the CNNF. Is it surprising that the mills,*

	from the big papermakers to the family-owned sawmills, are struggling to maintain wood in their wood yards? To be sure, energy prices are having a significant impact, but having access to nearby, abundant supplies would be enormously beneficial to these cornerstones of our local economy. **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 331-3 for an explanation how logging will not be affected by our decision.
332-3	**Comment:** *In their environmental assessment, the USFS dismissed the economic impact that the proposed road closure could have on the area. They determined that it was an insignificant issue. I'm sure that the areas that surround the CNNF would argue otherwise. As with any economic dislocation, the ripple effects are wide and deep. Schools throughout the north are suffering from declining enrollment and reduced operating revenues. Small town retail stores and restaurants lie as vacant witnesses to a town that was once there. All because a few faraway utopians with no connection to these northern communities force their idealism upon us.* **Response:** The economic impacts of motorized use in Wisconsin are controversial (see Recreation report). We understand that people easily reach the conclusions you state in your comment. Unfortunately, we did not find any definitive conclusion that supports that our decision will result in an adverse economic effect to local economies. We found in our research that motor vehicle use can benefit both tourism and related dollars to local communities. However, we also found countering costs due to increased law enforcement needs and environmental damage. Finally, we found no evidence in our research that concentrating motorized use on fewer roads will reduce recreation overall. For a more detailed discussion on this issue, please see Appendix A to this document.
332-4	**Comment:** *With this current proposal, the USFS says not only are we going to shut down logging, we are going to eviscerate your tourism/hospitality industry. The reduction in roads will impact tourists who come to the area to enjoy a variety of outdoor activities from bird watching to snowmobiling. How long will it be before no motorized trails will be allowed on the CNNF? It is quite evident from their past actions that the environmental extremists seek no hint of motorized recreation there. Snowmobile and ATV enthusiasts ask only for a small footprint on the land. They respect the right of others, whether equestrian or silent sports enthusiasts, to have their place in the CNNF, but the same respect is not given to them*. **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with wheeled motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). Snowmobiles are exempt from this decision. We believe this amount of road miles provides ample access for people while also minimizing the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. We will continually accept specific suggestions for additional road and trails as we update the MVUM. We strive to provide the access people need so they enjoy the outdoors on the National Forest. Please also see response to comment 331-3 for an explanation how logging will not be affected by our decision.
332-5	**Comment:** *This road reduction proposal greatly impacts hunting access in the CNNF, making it much more difficult to reach*

	parts of the land to hunt. In the instance of disabled hunters and anglers, this proposal poses an even larger problem. It will be very difficult for these individuals to reach their former hunting or angling grounds with so many of the roads closed and their mobility limited. Organizations like the Ruffed Grouse Society are working diligently with the USFS to create some of the finest wildlife habitat in North America. Is that to go for naught? **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Outdoor recreation is about individual choice, including the type of recreation opportunity and the type of access. Local Forest Service staff can help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. Our staff also can direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences, easy access, and the sense of remoteness. We are committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking.
332-6	**Comment:** *As a result of the severe underharvesting on the CNNF, we are witnessing not only the removal of the resource that helps drive the economic engine of northern communities but our very own federal government has become a bad neighbor. The lack of harvesting creates a situation that could lead to increased outbreaks of insects and disease. It will be only a matter of time before we have a major forest fire. Some may only be concerned with USFS lands, but there are hundreds of neighbors who are dependent on the USFS being a good neighbor. Hospitality businesses located at the portals to the forest derive a portion of their existence from an active, robust CNNF.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with wheeled motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We believe this amount of road miles provides ample access for people while also minimizing the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. We will continually accept specific suggestions for additional road and trails as we update the MVUM. We strive to provide the access people need so they enjoy the outdoors on the National Forest. Timber management is outside the scope of our decision; please also see response to comment 331-3 for an explanation how logging will not be affected by our decision.
332-7	**Comment:** *The USFS should immediately rescind the initiative to reduce road access by 55%. The USFS employees in the CNNF should go back to their leadership in Washington DC and tell them this is unacceptable. If the CNNF employees need us in the north to bring a caravan of people to Washington to emphasize this poor decision to leadership, we will. Otherwise, if the USFS insists on forcing the reduction on the good people of northern Wisconsin, an equivalent number of Forest Service employees should be laid-off. It is unfortunate, but without the timber to harvest or the roads to manage, these employees will no longer be needed just like the employees in the restaurants, the sawmills and the paper mills.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. Our decision is primarily based on the specific road suggestions we received from people—our Washington, DC leadership did not make this decision. We chose this method of soliciting specific road suggestions to gain a better understanding of the access people need for their activities. The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with wheeled motor

	vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We believe this amount of road miles provides ample access for people while also minimizing the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. Finally, we will continually accept specific suggestions for additional road and trails as we update the MVUM. Please see comment 331-3 for an explanation of how our decision does not affect logging.
332-8	**Comment:** *Let's turn back from the path of community destruction and turn to the path of opportunity that our parents and grandparents blazed in previous generations on the CNNF.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Our decision is primarily based on the specific road suggestions we received from people—our Washington, DC leadership did not make this decision. We chose this method of soliciting specific road suggestions to gain a better understanding of the access people need for their activities. We will continually accept specific suggestions for additional road and trails as we update the MVUM.
333-1	**Comment:** *Thank you for working with clubs and businesses and towns to see what is needed for trails and keeping this open so that as time changes you can change with it.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; we look forward to working with various clubs and businesses in the future as we update the MVUM.
333-2	**Comment:** *In Marinette County as the Forest department sees a need to move the trail off a road and a opening comes up to move the trail it can be and it has in the past few times.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We also plan to use a regular updating process to incorporate new suggestions about adding or removing roads from the MVUM.
333-3	**Comment:** *No one likes to ride on black top but it is better than not at all. (It's) To get where we would like to go. So keep it in mind if an opening comes up to move a trail, look into it.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; our process to update the MVUM allows for adding or removing roads from the map. We will continue to accept specific suggestions from people to help us understand what exactly should be updated on the map.
333-4	**Comment***: I like Alternative number 3 for the area I like to ride which is Lakewood-Laona.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
334-1	**Comment***: After review of the Environmental Assessment by our Club members, we find that Alternative #1 bests suits the needs of our Club members, and the general public. Specifically, Alternative #1 at least preserves access for HLVs, whose operators are 4WD enthusiasts, Nature Enthusiasts, and Hunters. It also preserves dual purpose use of roads where ATVs and HLVs can use the same road.*

	Response: Thank you for your club's comment; please see response to comments 181-3 for our explanation why choosing Alternative 1 would be an irresponsible choice.
334-2	**Comment:** *In the meetings, there were repeated requests for more access to our forest, an item which the EA specifies as a "significant issue". We find that the Forest Service has not listened to their stake holders as none of the Alternatives offer more access for users of the Forest.* **Response:** Public involvement has been a very important component in how we approached this project. We held 15 open houses in 2007 to solicit public input on specific roads. Ten open houses were held in January and February 2007, five for the public and five for governmental entities. Five open houses were held in October 2007 to present our initial proposal to the public and to solicit additional comments. The Decision Notice (pages 7-9) also describes the process the Forest Service used to inform and involve the public for this project. The significant issue of "not enough motorized access" related to people's reaction to our initial proposal in October 2007. Alternative 3 was developed to accommodate the additional 59 miles of roads suggested to us. Our decision adds another 205 miles of road based on comments we received during the 30-day comment period. We will continually listen to people and accept specific information they have for roads and trails as we update the MVUM.
334-3	**Comment:** *For those wanting more access, or even no change in access, Alternatives #2, and #3 are not an option. These plans decrease the amount of available roads to HLVs. HLVs are used my many Forest users including Hunters and Outdoor enthusiasts. Decreasing access to Hunters will likely create a wild life management problem where there was none before.* **Response:** The Decision Notice (pages 7-9) also describes the process the Forest Service used to inform and involve the public for this project. The significant issue of "not enough motorized access" related to people's reaction to our initial proposal (which became Alternative 2) in October 2007. Alternative 3 was developed to accommodate the additional 59 miles of roads suggested to us. Our decision adds another 205 miles of road based on comments we received during the 30-day comment period. We will continually listen to people and accept specific information they have for roads and trails as we update the MVUM. We have also consulted with the WDNR on game management issues, including those that relate to motorized access on the CNNF.
334-4	**Comment:** *None of the Alternatives address the request by ATV users of having more access. Every alternative offered by the EA, shows 318 miles of trails. Alternative #3 actually takes present dual purpose routes and assigns them as ATV only.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 334-2 for an explanation how we developed Alternative 3 to address the significant issue of "not enough motorized access."
334-5	**Comment:** *As regular users of the Pipeline Trail, we see how the forest is affected by traffic, and how it is used. We also have seen the affect that clear cutting sections of the forest off Chickadee Rd produced. We understand that the Nicolet and Chequamegon Forests are working forests and the need for balance in its use. Our Clubs members do not require pristine gravel roads to enjoy the outdoors, but we do require access to the Forest to enjoy it.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. We recognize the Forest users have different preferences on their access.

	Regardless, we solicited specific road suggestions from people to gain a better understanding of the access people need for their activities. The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with wheeled motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We believe this amount of road miles provides ample access for people while also minimizing the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. Finally, we will continually accept specific suggestions for additional road and trails as we update the MVUM.
335-1	**Comment:** *Consider the economic impact. I have participated in one of the events Alex mentions, one called the Big Woods 200 held in September in Wabeno, WI. I urge you to contact the Wabeno chamber of commerce or other local businesses such as gas stations, restaurants and motels and ask them how they would feel if the event were to be cancelled.* **Response:** We appreciate your concern for economic impacts to the local communities. We examined the available information from the State of Wisconsin to determine what economic effects would result from our decision (see Recreation Report; also, please see the State of Wisconsin SCORP for extensive information on the economic contributions to Wisconsin's economy from non-motorized recreation and tourism). We discovered that motor vehicle users influence local economies both positively (i.e., increased revenue) and negatively (i.e., increase law enforcement and environmental damage). Finally, we discovered that no definitive conclusion exists that motor vehicle use exclusively benefits a local economy. Please also see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion regarding tourism.
335-2	**Comment:** *I spend all my vacation money in Michigan, Missouri, and Colorado because they have places to ride motorcycles off road. Mostly Michigan. It's sad that I have to drive 300 to 400 miles to ride in Michigan several weekends per year because there is no where with quality riding in Wisconsin.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Our decision includes 334 miles of trail available for motorcycle use. However, our 2004 Forest Plan specifically prohibited any motorized travel off established roads and trails. Off-road motorized use is not available on the CNNF.
336-1	**Comment***: Our events rely upon Forest Service roads for a good portion of our route and we have worked with the Laona Forest Service office for the past eight years to obtain the proper permits we need for our rides. We also work with Langlade County, Marinette County and many private land owners to put together our temporary routes of up to 150 miles per day. We use primarily gas tax roads in the CNNF for our events, but have used what I believe to be roads 830311, 2640A, 2363B, 83345, 2138, 2640, and 2640B. From what I can tell on the maps for Alternative 2 and 3 none of these roads are slated for closure.* **Response:** We appreciate your continued interest in holding motor vehicle events on the National Forest. 830311 and 83345 have been evaluated and identified for hlv use in the selected alternative. FR 2640A, FR 2363B, FR 2138, FR 2640, and FR 2640B are currently open and available for hlv use. Please also note that road use governed by special use permits for special events is outside the scope of our decision.
336-2	**Comment:** *First of all I would like to thank the Forest Service for managing ATV's and off-road motorcycles as the same by using the term OHV's. Because of this practice you have provided us riding opportunities such as the Flambeau Trail System (I am very*

	familiar with that system since I have a cottage on Pike Lake) and the Dead Horse Run System. The State of Wisconsin DNR does not have a registration program for off-road motorcycles so they are not permitted on DNR funded ATV trails. That is our problem, but we have a few very active people in the state that are working on a registration program for off-road motorcycles. Of the three alternatives available in the TMR, our club would support Alternative 1 because it provides us with the greatest amount of available mileage; however we certainly do not view this alternative as a win-win situation for both our interest and the interest of those whom want to limit the amount of road mileage in the CNNF. The issue we have with Alternative 2 and 3 is that approximately 2,500 miles of roads are being closed and although the CNNF Forest Plan allows up to 100 miles of additional ATV trails on the Chequamegon side, I am not aware of any proposals to establish these additional sustainable OHV trails in the near future. Our club could support Alternative 2 or 3 if more loops or networks of trail beyond the potential 100 miles were established. The TMR does not say if specific proposals for additional 100 miles of OHV trails exist or not. **Response:** The unauthorized roads addressed by our decision (of which approximately 2,300 miles would be unavailable for motor vehicle use) are roads that we have not determined are necessary for the protection, administration, and use of the Forest. These unauthorized roads are roads that are not part of our current road system. Our decision primarily addresses highway-legal vehicle access. ATV trail access increased by 18 miles from what is available today. The MVUM will display which roads and trails are available to ATVs. Constructing new ATV trails was outside the scope of the Travel Management Project. Any new ATV trail projects will be decided by local officials at the District level. We encourage you to contact your local Forest Service official to discuss opportunities for new trail construction.
336-3	**Comment***: If we could make recommendations for what type of trail would make a quality trail system, the Flambeau Trail System would be a very good example. The mileage is nice, at 60 miles, the terrain is varied with a lot of curves and turns, and facilities for food, gas, and camping are available. What is not needed is a large number of miles located on maintained gravel roads. This type of route does not make for a quality ridding experience. Gravel roads would be a good way to link different networks together, however. As motorcyclist our most revered type of trail is called "single track", it would most likely resemble a narrow hiking trail to the average person. This type of trail is not much wider than a motorcycle; ATV's would not fit on these trails. The ridding is slow and technical. A twenty mile single track loop would be of a nice length. Clark County has a 16 mile loop of single track, and about 20 miles is being developed at an OHV park on the Mole Lake Indian Reservation, other than that I am not aware of any other in the State of Wisconsin. The State of Michigan maintains over 900 miles of motorcycle single track trail. Some of this trail is located in the Ottawa, Hiawatha, and Manistee National Forest.* **Response:** Thank you for describing your desired riding experience. Regarding single-track trails, the development of additional trails, loops, or connectors will be local decisions at the Ranger District where the proposal is located. We encourage you to contact your local Forest Service official to discuss opportunities for new trail construction.
336-4	**Comment:** *A major shortage of ridding opportunities exists in the state of Wisconsin. The TMR states "There are approximately 244,000 registered ATV's in Wisconsin, which is four times the number registered since 1993 (NHAL 2008). Approximately 23% of the population (959,400 people) use ATV's and 18% of the population participates in operating a vehicle off-road (SCORP, 2004)." Those are some very large numbers. On top of the ATV registration number, exists an unknown number of off-road*

	motorcycles. There are now more registered ATV's in Wisconsin than there are snowmobiles and snowmobiles have access to approximately 20,000 miles in the state. A Wisconsin DNR report in 2004 estimates 5,555 miles of roads or trails available for ATV riding (SCORP) in Wisconsin. I am not sure exactly what those 5,555 miles are comprised of but I would think a lot of it is routes, or mostly maintained gravel roads that are open to regular vehicle traffic. The Recreation Report section of the TMR notes "ATV's are permitted at the Richard I Bong Recreation Area, two state forests and seven state trails (DNR Board meeting, 2006)." Other places may exist but that report only indicates ten places to ride the 244,000 plus OHV's in the state. It would be great if another four or five networks or loops of OHV trail were developed with in the CNNF, the 100 miles of potential new trails listed in the Forest Plan is not enough. **Response:** Thank you for your interest in expanding ATV riding opportunities on the CNNF. With our decision, ATV trail access remains essentially the same as what is available today. The MVUM will display which roads and trails are available to ATVs. Constructing new ATV trails was outside the scope of the Travel Management Project. However, any new ATV trail projects will be decided by local officials at the District level. We encourage you to contact your local Forest Service official to discuss opportunities for new trail construction.
336-5	**Comment:** *I hope my comments on the TMR have not strayed too far from constructive feed back on specific roads to an opportunity to ask for more ridding opportunities but I feel the two are intertwined since Alternative 2 and 3 are cutting the number of road miles by 2,500. I do sincerely appreciate your time in reviewing our comments on this truly monumental project. I am not sure if this opportunity exists, but I would certainly like to make myself available to you or anyone in the Forest Service if you solicit ideas or feedback on proposed or existing trails.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 336-2 for an explanation of what ATV access is currently available and future opportunities to develop additional ATV trails.
337-1	**Comment:** *This unique land calls to the deep longing in people for peace and quiet. The pines whisper to us as we walk along a cold, but sparkling, blue river, as it sings and gurgles and hums along on its way. Tall ferns swish as we brush into them, causing dragonflies to lift and soar away. As we follow their flight we hear a caw from a noisy, alarm-sounding crow as it is warning its fellow dwellers of an intruder in their midst. Overhead an eagle sails along with an eye out for a fish for its dinner. Deer scatter, rabbits scramble for cover, a raccoon chatters from a tree as its meal is interrupted. There, over there is sign of a bear that has been raiding a berry patch. Care is needed here. Not only for the humans that walk or bike, or ski, with or without the family dog, but for all the wild life around us. Even with all these wildlife noises, it is still quiet and comforting. Birch trees shiver in the wind, maples seem to be so sturdy and strong as they prepare for the coming fall. Color they say, we need to say farewell to summer with a color parade. Ah, the quiet of the northwood. But wait! There is a snarl, a grinding of gears, a yell of excitement as a roaring ATV comes crashing through the rough trail it has already ground into the humid soil of the marsh. More roaring, more speed, more noise that is greater then the surrounding wildlife it is scaring away. Out of its nest, out of its safety, out of its peaceful hunting.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective on a non-motorized forest experience. We strived to respect this perspective with

	our decision. The resources you describe are ones we used to evaluate the resource risks with each suggested road. We attempted to balance the needs of people who desire a non-motorized experience with those people who want to use motor vehicles on the National Forest.
337-2	**Comment***: There is a demand for more trails, so they can go faster, farther into the woodland, leaving its trails of fumes, its ruts of destruction, and along the way cans and plastic and paper and Styrofoam boxes, and empty oil and water and beer containers. Oh, that's right. We were told these are careful, considerate lawfully attentive individuals. They would not allow for the few who do these dreadful things. We promise. We bought that promise of policing of their own. But, look how that has been ignored once they got the right to have a trail. They now feel they can use it anyway they want to and to heck with the rules. My apology to those who do follow the rules. We like you to come up here to our land and enjoy the nature around you, but do you think enough is enough and stop pushing for more, and for less for the creatures and the humans who also like to use our precious, beautiful, and dwindling forest. I for one, want to know the people in charge of caring for these wonderful areas, are also looking out for us of the silent sports.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective on a non-motorized forest experience. We strived to respect this perspective with our decision. We attempted to balance the needs of people who desire a non-motorized experience with those people who want to use motor vehicles on the National Forest.
337-3	**Comment:** *My faith is in your caring of the Forests that have grown here in their quiet glory. Thank You. A very elder citizen of the area my entire life.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective on a non-motorized forest experience. We strived to respect this perspective with our decision.
338-1	**Comment:** *We would like to comment on the Travel Management Rule (TMR) for the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest (CNFF) proposal. Events that our affiliated clubs run, such as motorcycle dual-sport rides rely heavily on the Forest Service roads as part of the routes we run. Other events such as weekend social trail rides and family outings also rely on the Forest Service roads. In examining the different proposals in the TMR environmental assessment we would prefer option one over the other two options presented. Option one retains the most mileage of the different types of 'roads' as defined by the USFS. My interests in these are using them on our street legal dual-sport on/off road motorcycles and with our Jeep/4X4 vehicles. Because of a lack of a registration program in Wisconsin for OHM and 4X4 vehicles we have very few miles of trails in the state; about 50 miles of single track for the OHM riders and 7 miles of trails for the 4X4 vehicle (the Pipeline). The OHM are allowed on some ATV trails in the state, but outside of USFS land the bikes are not included in the definition of an ATV. Thus it's up to the individual counties to allow or disallow the dirt bikes use on their ATV trails. Recent loss of ATV trails to non-street legal dirt bikes in Jackson County only exasperates and emphasizes the problem of a general lack of OHM trails in the state. We are currently working on a registration program for off-highway motorcycles so we can establish funding for OHM specific trails. The Jeep/4X4 drivers are doing a separate program to address their needs. But passing and adopting the registration programs will take time and building any new trails will take even longer. NEPA is not an easy process to go through. Loosing trails and forest roads through the TMR*

	process will not help at this time as the OHV riding community grows and needs more trails than we currently have access to. **Response:** Events such as the motorcycle dual-sport ride are authorized by a special use permit. Even if a road is closed to public motorized use through this project, it should not affect the event as one time uses of closed roads can be authorized through the permit process. Our decision increases the miles of roads available to ATVs and motorcycles increases by 71 miles and the mile of trails available to ATVs and motorcycles in creases by 16 miles. It is recommended that if you have specific roads that you would like to see remain open these should be submitted for analysis and a decision would be made in the future updates to the MVUM.
338-2	**Comment:** *There is a need in Wisconsin for additional trails due to the growth in OHV use. This growth can in part be managed by partnering with the OHV community. We want to add OHM single track trails and loops, additional ATV trails to connect the various systems in the state, create some challenging truck/Jeep trails (rock crawls plus trails of various difficulties). Part of the answer to meeting these needs is to get clubs to adopt existing trails, help create and build new trails, and adopt these trails and help in their maintenance, all in partnership with the appropriate state and federal agencies. There are a number of examples of clubs partnering with state entities to do just this. If there are no local clubs then the OHV associations will have to step up and help start local clubs where there are none.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We encourage you to continue working with clubs and promoting trail adoptions in support of trail maintenance.
338-3	**Comment:** *Measures must also be taken to address the use of UTV or LUV vehicles. These vehicles are showing up in growing numbers and it would be beneficial to add them to the definition of ATV. A registration program for these vehicles is also in development in order to make funds available for trail development and maintenance.* **Response:** We appreciate your interest in these vehicles. UTV/LUV vehicles are currently not recognized by the State of Wisconsin for any use on public lands. Our 2004 Forest Plan also does not recognize UTVs/LUVs as an example of an ATV (see page 3 of the EA). As such, we did not consider these vehicles in our decision–these vehicles are not allowed on Forest roads and trails. We are aware of a pilot program through the State that is evaluating the use of UTVs/LUVs. We are waiting for the State to conclude their study before we consider UTV/LUV use on the National Forest.
338-4	***Comment:*** *We don't like seeing existing roads closed; once they are gone it's hard to get them back or get replacement miles. It's recognized that the USFS has limited resources to maintain all of them. But the trails not being maintained at this time should still be available; they are still being used even if sporadically, and they still remain useful to potential users. Hunters and others already help keep them in use even if they are only used sporadically during the hunting season or to get to favorite fishing or kayaking sites. If we lose them now then we may have lost them for years to come with little chance for replacement.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concerns with us. We have standards for road maintenance based on environmental and safety considerations. Roads open to general public motorized use must meet these standards. It is our responsibility to ensure that people can travel safely on the National Forest. We will continually accept people's suggestions to add or remove

	roads and trails from the MVUM for future map updates. We believe this is responsive to people who feel that they do not have adequate access to enjoy the National Forest.
338-5	**Comment***: I'm worried that because of staffing and funding issues and despite the best of intentions that we would have little action and a general lack of response from the USFS if we close down existing 'roads' and then ask for more trails in the future. NEPA can be a daunting and expensive process to go through for any new trail requests and as a reality check the process potentially becomes difficult when dealing with groups with different views.* **Response:** We recognize that access to public lands, whether it be motorized or non-motorized, can be controversial. We will continually accept people's suggestions to add or remove roads and trails from the MVUM for future map updates. We believe this is responsive to people who feel that they do not have adequate access to enjoy the National Forest. We will provide an opportunity for people to view and comment on which roads and trails we are considering for a map update. We will meet our NEPA obligations in updating the MVUM each year–that will be an important to our update process.
338-6	**Comment:** *Option 2 we find unacceptable because of the loss of trails and roads and no additional mileage. Option 3 has some merit because of the important increase in new ATV trails and roads added to the Eastern portion of the forest with the ongoing projects that appear on the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest April-June 2008 Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA). But the loss of road mileage makes it unacceptable overall.* **Response:** Many people like yourself expressed an opinion in clear support of, or opposition to, one of the alternatives considered in the EA. We considered each of these opinions in making our decision. We believe Alternative 3 (as modified) best meets people's needs by providing a sustainable and accessible network of roads and trails. As you note, Alternative 3 provides more access than Alternative 2. Alternative 3 also allows increased access during the fall hunting season while balancing the need for non-motorized use. Choosing Alternative 1 at this time would be irresponsible. If we choose to do nothing and allow the current motor vehicle use to continue unmanaged, we believe that your experience on the National Forest will decrease while environmental impacts would likely increase. Putting all the unauthorized roads on the map without any site-specific evaluation would likely lead to environmental damage that in some cases could be irreversible. We believe our decision balances the access needs while also accounting for the environmental impacts associated with that access.
338-7	**Comment:** *We would propose that option one with the addition of the new trails being developed in option 3 would be the best overall solution. In addition the USFS also has to address the UTV/LUV issue, OHM single track trails need to be added, Jeep/4X4 needs have to be addressed, and partnering with the state OHV associations has to also be part of the solution.* **Response:** Thank you for your suggestions. We chose Alternative 3 (as modified) to provide ample access to people while also accounting for the environmental impacts that are associated with this access. UTV/LUV vehicles are currently not recognized by the State of Wisconsin for any use on public lands. Our 2004 Forest Plan also does not recognize UTVs/LUVs as an example of an ATV (see page 3 of the EA). As such, we did not consider these vehicles in our decision – these vehicles are not allowed on Forest roads and trails. We are aware of a pilot program through the State that is evaluating the use of UTVs/LUVs. We are

	waiting for the State to conclude their study before we consider UTV/LUV use on the National Forest. New trail construction is not part of this decision, but we will continue look for opportunities to develop new trails for people's enjoyment. We encourage you to work with our local Forest Service officials and share your ideas for these types of trails.
338-8	**Comment:** *Thank you for allowing WOHMA, WOHVA, and NOHVCC to present our views regarding the Environmental Assessment for the Chequamegon-Nicolet Travel Management Rule. We welcome the opportunity to partner with the USFS in addressing and solving the issues regarding OHV recreation in Wisconsin and we want to be part of the solution in improving OHV recreation and providing safe and enjoyable trails for all users.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; we appreciate all public input and partnering you have provided on this project. We look forward to our continued collaboration in providing access to the National Forest.
339-1	**Comment:** *I am strongly opposed to the possible road closures in the Chequamegon-Nicolet Forest. It seems that the consequences of doing this greatly outweigh any benefits that may be gained.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We are addressing the growing number of users of this National Forest and in particular, those people who use motor vehicles to enjoy the National Forest. We recognize that using motor vehicles on the National Forest is a legitimate use. We are striving to provide ample access for people's enjoyment while also limiting the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. Please see comment 181-3 for further explanations on why we are making this decision.
339-2	**Comment:** *Each year studies and articles come out about the growing deer population and how there are way to many and we need to thin out the herd. Closing a large percentage of these roads seems to greatly hinder being able to accomplish this. Unfortunately numerous hunters are not going to be able to walk the miles to the areas where they are accustomed to going. Now if all of these hunters are limited to the area where they can hunt it would seem obvious that other areas of the forest are going to see a very large number of hunters and simply become overcrowded. It would be a really shame to start seeing accidents happen, just because hunters can no longer access the areas they have been going for years.* **Response:** The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We believe this avoids forcing people into smaller areas. We understand that a reduction in available roads is one of many factors that can influence hunter success (for deer, bear, grouse or turkey). However, our decision does not affect the hunting opportunity on the CNNF. With the exception of campgrounds and administrative sites, the vast majority of the CNNF will continue to be open to hunters. If there are desired roads that are not on the MVUM, people will continue to have opportunities to submit suggestions to us to add those roads for a map update.
339-3	**Comment:** *The biggest issue with the proposed closure is that no ones know anything about it. From the people that I have been able to talk to they know nothing about it and feel frustrated and cheated that they would not know about something that could*

	greatly impact their livelihood. **Response:** We understand that people may be hearing about this decision for the first time. We agree wholeheartedly that public involvement is very important in the development of alternatives for proposed actions on Forest lands. We held 15 open houses in 2007 to solicit public input on specific roads. Ten open houses were held in January and February 2007, five for the public and five for governmental entities. Five open houses were held in October 2007 to present our initial proposal to the public and to solicit additional comments. The Public Involvement section of the DN (pages 7-9) also describes the process we used to inform and involve the public for this project. In addition, the CNNF sends press releases to an extensive statewide media list, which includes newspapers, television stations, and radio stations. For those people that hear about this decision for the first time, we will continually accept specific road suggestions to be added or removed for a map update.
339-4	**Comment:** *Luckily I am not a business owner in one of the small communities that depends on the revenue they receive from hunters and outdoor enthusiasts that come to enjoy these national forests. It would only be a matter of time before these people become frustrated with the limited access that is offered them and they decide to stay home and not bring their money to these businesses that will most likely fail without this support.* **Response:** The economic impacts of motorized use in Wisconsin are controversial (see Recreation report). We understand that people easily reach the conclusions you state in your comment. Unfortunately, we did not find any definitive conclusion that supports that our decision will result in an adverse economic effect to local economies. We found in our research that motor vehicle use can benefit both tourism and related dollars to local communities. However, we also found countering costs due to increased law enforcement needs and environmental damage. Finally, we found no evidence in our research that concentrating motorized use on fewer roads will reduce recreation overall. Please see Appendix A to this document for more information.
339-5	**Comment:** *In a society that is turning more and more fast paced our national forests are there for people to enjoy and for young and old to learn more about the world in which we live. Greatly restricting the access that people have to them would be a real shame.* **Response:** We welcome all people to the National Forest. Outdoor recreation is about individual choice, including the type of recreation opportunity and the type of access. As such, we balance the available recreational opportunities across the spectrum of personal interests. The designated roads and trails authorized by our decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We believe this provides ample access for people to still enjoy the National Forest in the manner they desire.
339-6	**Comment:** *If certain areas are being threatened by off-road use lets address those areas first along with the people who may be abusing them. Let's not let the actions of a few people have an impact on the enjoyment of the majority.* **Response:** The intent of our decision is to provide sustainable opportunities for public motor vehicle use while also protecting the resources that people want to use. With the increases in population and motor vehicle use, we can no longer allow motor vehicle use to occur in an unmanaged condition. Please see response to comment 181-3 for further explanation of why we are

	addressing this use of the National Forest.
340-1	**Comment***: We are against any closing of roads in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest.* **Response:** Many people expressed an opinion in clear support of, or opposition to, one of the alternatives considered in the EA. We considered all the comments we received on the EA, which helped us make our decision. It is important to remember that our evaluation of each alternative did not hinge upon consideration of a single factor or Forest activity, such as not closing any roads. We must consider the costs and benefits of the alternative as a whole along with the broad spectrum of interests people have in using the National Forest. Our decision provides ample access to the National Forest while also balancing the environmental impacts associated with that access.
340-2	**Comment***: I'm 59 and have hunted Ruffed Grouse and deer since I was 12. I went along with my dad in the 50's and enjoyed learning about the woods and hunting. I have many fond memories of staying in our small trailer parked behind the gas station in Alvin (for power) in the late 50's & early 60's. My wife of 39 yrs. goes along with me. Our son hunted also until he moved to Ca. We still hunt some of the very same roads that my Father & I used to hunt on. We cook out with our Coleman stove in the exact same spots that I cooked out with my Dad. We don't see any problems with too many hunters, ATV's, etc. If you close these roads you will spoil a good thing! You will force people to change where they hunt-fish etc. This will lead them to try and find other places to hunt-fish-etc. which will make the woods seem more crowded because of less roads and land to use* **Response:** Thank you for your sharing your life-long experience of using the National Forest. The designated roads and trails authorized by our decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We believe this still avoids forcing people into the same area. We believe this provides ample access for people to still enjoy the National Forest in the manner they desire.
340-3	**Comment:** *What happens in the future if a fire breaks out and these roads are closed and full of windfalls etc. and you can't access them? We have friends in Montana and they wish they had all their old logging roads to get at the fires.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concern. Our decision provides a designated network of roads and trails available for the general public's use of motor vehicles. This network is only a portion of our entire transportation system. We will continue to use other roads for administrative activities, such as timber harvesting, wildfire response, search and rescue, etc. Please note that we have determined that many of the unauthorized roads are not necessary for us to manage the National Forest. Otherwise, we would have included them as part of our overall transportation system. We will continue to have the ability to access the Forest where needed to conduct Forest management activities or emergency actions.
340-4	**Comment:** *This sure has been kept quiet! If it wasn't for the Milwaukee Journal- Sentinel article on 7-18-08 we never would of known anything about this. Every person who has a hunting-fishing license, owns land in the area should have been notified about this! Those who use the area should have a say in this matter.* **Response:** We understand that people may be hearing about this decision for the first time. We agree wholeheartedly that

	public involvement is very important in the development of alternatives for proposed actions on Forest lands. We held 15 open houses in 2007 to solicit public input on specific roads. Ten open houses were held in January and February 2007, five for the public and five for governmental entities. Five open houses were held in October 2007 to present our initial proposal to the public and to solicit additional comments. The Public Involvement section of the DN (pages 7-9) also describes the process we used to inform and involve the public for this project. In addition, the CNNF sends press releases to an extensive statewide media list, which includes newspapers, television stations, and radio stations. For those people that hear about this decision for the first time, we will continually accept specific road suggestions to be added or removed for a map update.
340-5	**Comment***: There are more people wanting to use the National Forest for a variety of reasons. But, lets not hinder their enjoyment of the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest by limiting their access to it. More roads, not less. This forest belongs to everyone, keep it open to everyone!* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We are addressing the growing number of users of this National Forest and in particular, those people who use motor vehicles to enjoy the National Forest. We recognize that using motor vehicles on the National Forest is a legitimate use. We are striving to provide ample access for people's enjoyment while also limiting the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. Please see comment 181-3 for further explanations on why we are making this decision.
341-1	**Comment:** *We would like to add our voice to the many other lovers of nature that encourage you to continue with the plan to close 55% of the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest to motorized access. We are deer hunters and enjoy both bow and gun hunting, including muzzle loading. We also enjoy the experience of the sounds of nature not being disturbed by the roar and whine of motorized traffic. We also enjoy the smells of nature; there is enough exposure to toxic exhaust fumes without being exposed to them while trying to enjoy the natural experience that non-motorized areas of the forest provide. We have used the forest roads for easy access to hunting, but we are willing to let nature have the land back, even if it means walking further and dragging the deer further. The importance of wild areas outweighs the convenience of driving to a hunting spot. We are also silent sports enthusiasts, enjoying hiking, mountain biking, snow shoeing and skiing, and find that the noise and intrusion of motorized access is getting out-of-hand. Not only for those of us who are quiet sports enthusiasts, but also for the wildlife that need spans of forest that are undisturbed in order to live and reproduce. Please continue your efforts to close these forest roads, for the sake of the land, nature, and those who love it.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective on a non-motorized forest experience. We strived to respect this perspective with our decision. The resources you describe are ones we used to evaluate the resource risks with each suggested road. We attempted to balance the needs of people who desire a non-motorized experience with those people who want to use motor vehicles on the National Forest.
342-1	**Comment:** *Although the past has seen an increased number of registered ATV's, I wonder if the future may not see a decrease in those ATV's along with a decrease in the value of the dollar and a decrease in cheap fossil fuel along with an increase in the demand for fuel. At that point, the significant issue of not enough motorized access may become insignificant in the face of the*

	more significant issue of not enough cheap fossil fuel. **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. One reason we initiated this project is the recognition that the number of people using the National Forest has grown dramatically. In particular, ATV registrations in Wisconsin have increased four-fold in the past 10 years. This change has made it more difficult for us to provide an enjoyable experience for non-motorized users.
342-2	**Comment:** *Until that happens, my most significant access issue is the lack of parking turnouts on forest roads that would allow me to park my car and walk the forest roads especially in the spring and summer when the deer ticks and insects are a concern on the forest trails. It would seem to me that the parking turnouts would also be of use for forest management purposes.* **Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. We did not specifically consider constructing parking lots and or turnouts to facilitate people's access to the National Forest. Our decision addressed the wheeled motor vehicle use by the general public and what roads and trails should be available for this use. We encourage you to work with our local Forest Service officials to explore opportunities for parking turnouts in the area you like to use.
343-1	**Comment***: I have reviewed the proposals for action contained in the CD that was sent. Initially, I was encouraged by the options presented, particularly Alternative 3, which seems to be a reasonable compromise to allow access at times that myself and others would utilize it (i.e. hunting season). I also appreciate that it protects certain sensitive areas of the forest and nesting wildlife at times of the year that are appropriate.* **Response:** We appreciate your observation. We attempted to seek a compromise between people's need for access and the environmental effects associated with that access.
343-2	**Comment:** *Unfortunately, as I studied the various maps of the proposals, I realized that the area that I am most concerned with (and had written and called about last year), is designated as a non-motorized area, and apparently is not even up for consideration as part of these Alternatives. The area that concerns me is the (recently designated) non-motorized area to the south of Highway 70 at the far east end of the forest, which is opposite the Whisker Lake Wilderness Area. I own recreational property within the area itself, and am frustrated by the access restrictions. Areas that I have been able to access by car or truck are now reasonably out of reach for hunting, especially for seniors with limited mobility (such as my father and neighboring hunters). I do not see the need for this non-motorized area since the Wilderness area is in the immediate area. I would support a compromise along the order of Alternative 3 for this area, allowing HLV access during the hunting season. Is there any room for consideration to open (at least seasonally) the gated roads in the area that I have referred to, or have the concerns of the public been ignored? Having read news stories in the Florence Mining News, and through conversations with many in the immediate area, I know that many people share my frustrations. I have yet to encounter one person who supports the closings of these roads.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. When we revised our Forest Plan in 2004, we chose to manage some parts of the Forest aggressively to achieve desired conditions and chose to set aside other areas for their natural condition. These choices resulted from many years of discussion with people on how they would like to see the National Forest managed. With some of

	these “natural condition” areas, we also chose to limit motor vehicle access to provide a non-motorized experience for people. We strived to balance people’s desires to use motor vehicles on the National Forest with those people who desire to experience the Forest without motor vehicles. We encourage you to engage your local Forest Service official to discuss your access needs. We will continually accept specific road and trail suggestions as we annually update the MVUM.
345-1	**Comment:** *Thank you for another opportunity to give my thoughts on the proposed travel plan. I attended both of the meetings on this issue at Wabeno and at Crandon. Neither meeting had the needed public attandance with the forest service personnel outnumbering the public at the Crandon meeting. The issue finally reached a wider audience in the July 25th issue of WISCONSIN OUTDOOR NEWS.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We attempted to broadly advertise the opportunities people had to engage us about this project. We realized that we would not be able to inform everyone, so we included in our decision the opportunity for people to continually discuss with us their access needs. We will accept specific suggestions to be add or remove roads and trails from the MVUM during our annual updates.
345-2	**Comment:** *I have enjoyed a lifetime of activities in the Nicolet National Forest. To close off as many forest roads as is being proposed will adversely affect many thousands of citizens. My way of thinking is to go with Option 1 at least during the hunting and trapping seasons. This would also allow wood gathering, mushroom picking, etc. If there are really that many water quality and erosion problems simply use gates or burms to close those roads.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We are addressing the growing number of users of this National Forest and in particular, those people who use motor vehicles to enjoy the National Forest. We recognize that using motor vehicles on the National Forest is a legitimate use. We are striving to provide ample access for people’s enjoyment while also limiting the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. Unfortunately, choosing Alternative 1 at this time would be irresponsible. If we choose to do nothing and allow the current motor vehicle use to continue unmanaged, we believe that your experience on the National Forest will decrease while environmental impacts would likely increase. Putting all the unauthorized roads on the map without any site-specific evaluation would likely lead to environmental damage that in some cases could be irreversible. Please see comment 181-3 for further explanations on why we are making this decision.
345-3	**Comment:** *I was extremely happy and grateful to hear from Joan Marburger recently that I will still be able to recieve my ATV handicap permit after the new policy is instituted. I will continue to be a good steward of the forest as it is an area that I love. Please consider option 1 or keeping as many options for forest use open for the general public and for those of us with special needs. Thanks for your consideration.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We are addressing the growing number of users of this National Forest and in particular, those people who use motor vehicles to enjoy the National Forest. We recognize that using motor vehicles on the National Forest is a legitimate use. We are striving to provide ample access for people’s enjoyment while also limiting the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. Unfortunately, choosing Alternative 1 at this time would be irresponsible. If we

	choose to do nothing and allow the current motor vehicle use to continue unmanaged, we believe that your experience on the National Forest will decrease while environmental impacts would likely increase.
346-1	**Comment:** *I was shocked to hear of the closure of nearly 50% of the roads and trails in The Chequamegon and Nicolet forests. I was able to reach Jeff Seefeldt in your organization. Jeff made the comment that some of these roads/trails that were to be closed were nearly unused and that erosion on those trails was a concern. If the trail/road is nearly unused then why is overuse a concern?* **Response:** Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the Forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the National Forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6,800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered “unauthorized roads”–roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the National Forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people’s need for that access.
346-2	**Comment:** *While preservation of our shared lands is very important if it is closed off to access who is it being preserved for? It's much like my great grandmother who covered her furniture with plastic instead of managing it's use. Who is going to enjoy the fabric? She didn't, she was dead when the plastic came off and someone sat on it.* **Response:** We appreciate the interest you have in this National Forest. We used this perspective to help us understand how to manage motor vehicle access today for the continued enjoyment of future generations. It is also this specific information we want people to share with us so we can effectively evaluate whether to designate a road or trail for motor vehicle use. We strongly encourage people to continually engage us and share their perspectives about access to the National Forest with us.
346-3	**Comment:** *For me the best part of the national forest is packing up my motorcycle and just getting lost. Getting lost in our country is not easy and the adventure of getting lost in the lands that I help pay for is a real relief in a world full of full connectivity and technology. Closed roads and trails eliminate possibilities of taking the roads less traveled.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your experience. Outdoor recreation is about individual choice, including the type of recreation opportunity and the type of access. We can help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We also can direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. Our decision helps preserve this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking.
346-4	**Comment:** *I have 3 spinal injuries that prevent me from going into anywhere on foot with a backpack. My motorcycle is how I get to enjoy the outdoors. I ride a bike with factory legal exhaust that is quiet and even use tires that don't dig in and tear up the turf.* **Response:** We appreciate your commitment to minimizing the effects of using your motorcycle on the National Forest. Our

	decision balances access to areas where motor vehicles are appropriate and areas where a non-motorized experience is desired. Our decision also preserve this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking.
346-5	**Comment***: I am sure that there are a few who abuse the privilege of the national forest but please do not exclude the majority of us for their sins. Open trails and roads are adventures waiting to happen for many of us who pick up our garbage and tread lightly.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We are addressing the growing number of users of this National Forest and in particular, those people who use motor vehicles to enjoy the National Forest. We recognize that using motor vehicles on the National Forest is a legitimate use. We are striving to provide ample access for people's enjoyment while also limiting the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. If we choose to do nothing and allow the current motor vehicle use to continue unmanaged, we believe that your experience on the National Forest will decrease while environmental impacts would likely increase.
347-1	**Comment:** *Wanted to make sure their organization was on the mailing list for future information: Wisconsin Wildlife Federation, 201 Randolph Dr., Madison, WI 53717*. **Response:** Thank you for the information.
348-1	**Comment:** *Ken has some questions as to the difference between the "Gas Tax" roads and the rest of the Forest Service Roads. I gave him a clear description. Ken will submit comments on limiting ATV use on the forest.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
349-1	**Comment:** *Robert had a comment about a road in the Town of Alvin off FR 2453, the east/west road south of 7111106 that he wants open to public travel. He didn't know the road number. I later called Robert back with the road number 7111107. This is the road he wants left open.* **Response:** This road is currently under litigation in the Northwest Howell project. The Northwest Howell Roads Analysis recommends this road to be left open for private access as well as other administrative uses. Because this project is under litigation, it will not be on the MVUM until the litigation is resolved.
350-1	**Comment:** *Jeff says there are a lot of inaccuracies on the Alt. #1 map. He said it would look like something a two year old would do. Jeff would like to work with us on getting correct road system displayed.* **Response:** We appreciate your offer to help. There are approximately 20,000 road entries in our data bases to confirm, this is an enormous task. We will continually take public input to improve the accuracy of the information we provide the public.

351-1	**Comment:** *Jim's comment to keep traffic number lower on the National Forest by choosing Alternative 2, specifically in regard to keeping the forest disturbance reduced for wolves especially during the mating season*. **Response:** Thank you for your comment. By seasonally closing roads to reduce the likelihood of impacts to denning/nesting activities during the breeding season, we expect our decision to have a beneficial impact on many wildlife species, including wolves.
352-1	**Comment:** *Michelle asked when the decision would be made on the alternatives*. **Response:** Our decision was made on September 22, 2008.
353-1	**Comment:** *John felt roads should be open to allow more access especially for hunting. Older people are not as able to get around by foot. In addition, fewer roads concentrate hunters into smaller areas instead of allowing for dispersion. He was concerned that many of the roads with current ATV signs would be closed.* **Response:** The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). Plus, we are maintaining the same number of ATV trail miles with this decision (334 miles). We believe this avoids forcing people into smaller areas. We understand that a reduction in available roads is one of many factors that can influence hunter success (for deer, bear, grouse or turkey). However, our decision does not affect the hunting opportunity on the CNNF. With the exception of campgrounds and administrative sites, the vast majority of the CNNF will continue to be open to hunters. If there are desired roads that are not on the MVUM, people will continue to have opportunities to submit suggestions to us to add those roads for a map update.
353-2	**Comment***: He thought Buffalo lake access should be open.* **Response:** Motorized access to Buffalo Lake (FR1742 and W224310) has been identified for hlv and atv in the selected alternative due to high public values and low resource risks associated with the roads.
353-3	**Comment***: He didn't like the non-motorized areas*. **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We understand that people have different viewpoints on how they use the National Forest. With our decision, we balanced the access needs of people who use motor vehicles with those people who desire a non-motorized experience.
354-1	**Comment:** *I am a resident of Racine county in Wisconsin and have made many trips over the years to the Northern part of the state to recreate by riding trails on my OHM (Off Highway Motorcycle). This is primarily due to the extremely limited riding opportunities available in the southern part of the state (Bong is often closed and does not provide any type of challenge to an experienced rider). I have ridden on many of the trails in question and would like to express my concern and opposition to closing any existing trails open to ATV use (motorcycles included). I am opposed to alternative 2 and 3 that would reduce the number of miles of trails and forest service roads available for ATV use. I am in favor of alternative 1 that would not close any of the current*

	trails and roads as I understand the various alternatives and I would furthermore support a proposal to increase the number of miles of trails available for ATV and or OHM (off highway motorcycle) use. I believe that National Forests should be available for use by the general public. While I am in favor of protecting our natural resources, including the forests and animals, I do not feel that OHV use, if managed and planned properly will have a negative affect on those resources. **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Our decision does not change the number of available ATV trail miles–we will continue to offer 334 miles of ATV trails on the Forest. Our decision addressed mainly roads available for highway-legal vehicle use. Many of the roadways that allow highway-legal vehicles are not available for ATV use. The MVUM will display which roads and trails are available for use and by which type of vehicle. Our decision balances the access needs of people who use motor vehicles with the environmental impacts associated with that use.
354-2	**Comment***: In particular as an OHM user I am very frustrated with the lack of single track OHM trails in the state and find myself travelling into Michigan or to Colorado to pursue this type of riding. Wisconsin I believe has more than adequate potential for further developing OHV use in the state without making a dramatic impact on any of the natural resources. If anything, I would like to see a plan that would also address the inclusion of single track OHM trails into the National Forest as this type of trail would have very minimal impact since they are only at the most 24" wide and require very little maintenance or money to build. This would also have an added benefit of reducing the number of OHM's on ATV trails and would result in a safer situation for all users.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Our decision includes 334 miles of trail available for ATV use, including motorcycles. However, our 2004 Forest Plan specifically prohibited any motorized travel off established roads and trails. Off-road motorized use is not available on the CNNF. We encourage you to engage our local Forest Service officials about future trail developments that meet your desires for OHM use.
354-3	**Comment:** *Any decision to reduce the number of miles of trails and roads available will put that much more burden on the remaining trails and would create increased concentration of use which will negatively affect the quality of the trails and the safety of those users and increase the cost and effort required to maintain those trails. Erosion and dust on the trails would be significantly increased over current levels making an already bad situation even worse*. **Response:** The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). Plus, we are maintaining the same number of ATV trail miles with this decision (334 miles). We believe this avoids forcing people into smaller areas. We conduct annual monitoring of road and trail conditions and will take results into consideration in future updates to the MVUM.
354-4	**Comment:** *I have seen and participated in other states in their trail building and maintenance programs and I personally believe that both Michigan and Colorado as well as some other western states have demonstrated how cooperation with the OHV community can help to affectively manage those natural resources by providing manpower to help maintain, construct, and monitor the trails and still provide a quality experience for its users.*

	Response: We agree that cooperation and coordination with state, Federal, and other governmental and user groups can enhance motorized recreation opportunities. We have appreciated the contributions from the OHV and ATV organized groups in helping us understand their perspectives and access needs. We welcome their continued involvement in our efforts to update the MVUM.
355-1	**Comment:** *I'm opposed to the extensive closing of trails to vehicular traffic in the National Forest. A very limited closing would be acceptable, but not at the percent suggested*. **Response:** Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the Forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the National Forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6, 800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered "unauthorized roads"–roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the National Forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people's need for that access.
355-2	**Comment:** *Much of Wisconsin is way above population goals in deer management units. Closing access will keep hunters away from the regions of high deer populations. The deer damage to the ecosystems from high deer populations is much greater than done by vehicles, I believe.* **Response:** We understand that a reduction in available roads is one of many factors that can influence hunter success (for deer, bear, grouse or turkey). However, our decision does not affect the hunting opportunity on the CNNF. With the exception of campgrounds and administrative sites, the vast majority of the CNNF will continue to be open to hunters. The roads available for motorized use with our decision could increase the average distance that a hunter would have to walk in or haul bait or a deer stand. However, this potential increase is not expected to measurably affect the magnitude of impact that hunters have in determining the size of Wisconsin's deer population. If there are roads that are not on the MVUM, people will continue to have opportunities to submit suggestions to us to add those roads for a map update.
355-3	**Comment:** *Enjoying elk, wolves and other wildlife and ecosystems can best to accomplish by allowing visitors to drive through many areas of the forest. From what I've seen in Bayfield County, it is primarily the ATVs that are causing much of the erosion problem. Set some trails aside for ATVs but restrict ATVs from some other areas. The noise from an ATV is far greater than from a car or truck, and so is the damage.* **Response:** Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the Forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the National Forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6,800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered "unauthorized roads"–roads that we

	have determined as unnecessary to manage the National Forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people's need for that access.
356-1	**Comment:** *I was looking at your map on ATV use and I could not find trail or road 1511 which runs south of cottage drive on the south end of the Mondeaux. I would like to see this trail open for ATV use during hunting season. By doing this it would help hunters put in stands and to drag out their catch. It is not as easy for seniors to do these tasks as it once was. This trail was improved when there was some logging done some years ago. There are no mud holes on this because when they but it in they put in a good road base and also but in culverts. Also it would help to keep this road passable if we would have a dry year and would have a forest fire. Thanks for your consideration.* **Response:** Road 1511 is already closed to public motor vehicle use through a local decision that occurred prior to this project. As such, we did not consider reversing this local decision.
357-1	**Comment***: I am writing to express my displeasure with the Forest service option to close Road ID 400. I support option 1 No action. Whoever wrote the comment obviously is not familiar with the road or its usage. I live 4-5 miles from this road and have for 37 years. This road is the primary road used to access this section for all types of hunting, recreation and traveling including the area referred to as "east of the berm" which is apparently the 6 inch bump 1/4 mile east of "Sandy Corners". The same is true for Road ID 393. This road is not overgrown with vegetation and i used all the time. It makes us wonder who rights this stuff and how come we don't see them as we are out there every day. Please refer me to whomever wrote these comments and register my comments in the online comments copying to me as I was unable to access.* **Response:** FR 400 is identified for highway vehicle (HLV) use only in our decision. On August 13, 2008, District Ranger recommended to leave this road designated as is. This road does present potential risks with the spread of invasive plant species to the nearby Research Natural Area (RNA). However, the high value of this road outweighed these potential risks and that road will continue to be available for public use in the Town of Drummond. Please note this will be a priority for the district to monitor for invasive species impacts to RNA. Because of this, we designated that road as HLV use only. The local district staff noted that 400 East and 440A have some relic berms; however, our database still has them as available for motor vehicle use and they are used as such.
358-1	**Comment:** *Concerning the travel management project I have to voice opposition to the whole concept. I spent some years working on a local access plan, and learned that common sense and practical use has been sold out. Specifically this plan seems to condemn all motorized use and puts the invasive species threat mainly on motorized use as a fault. Overlooked is the fact that Horses introduce more invasive seeds from undigested seeds in feed and deposited in manure than could ever be tied to rubber wheeled vehicles. The "big spring" area in the Nicolet national forest in Langland county has been blocked off with rocks for motorized access. A large number of horses are allowed to access and water out of this pristine spring pond that feeds a trout stream. The erosion alone is incredible not to mention the seed spreading.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. People's use of the National Forest was an important consideration for us (please

	refer to page 27 of the Decision Notice for the public values and resource risks we considered). We strived for a balance to provide access for the uses mentioned here, whether it be by motor vehicles or other non-motorized means.
358-2	**Comment:** *The maps you provide of these roads being shut off are nearly impossible to identify these areas, that alone I would find questionable and conflicting.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We appreciate the feedback on how effective the maps for displaying information. We encourage you to contact one of our local Forest Service offices for additional help in reading the maps.
358-3	**Comment:** *The invasive argument is a conflict also. Without so called invasive's we would have no European honeybee's, no brown trout, no apple trees, and countless other species that have benefits. This idea does not matter to the US Forest Service as they have seen fit to poison trout that have been naturally re-producing since the early 1900's in mountain lakes, just because they were non-native.* **Response:** Non-native, invasive species are defined as non-indigenous species or strains that become established in natural communities and wild areas and cause economic or environmental harm. This harm can occur by inhibiting the establishment of tree seedlings, changing the composition and function of native plant communities, out-competing native plants, and reducing available forage for wildlife. It is this harm that we are most concerned. You are correct that about 25% of the plants in North America are not indigenous and many are beneficial. Only around 10% of these non-native species are aggressively invasive and cause economic or environmental harm. We used the potential of these species becoming established on roads and trails as a measure of risk to allow motor vehicle use on those roads and trails.
358-4	**Comment:** *The very idea that taxpayers will have access to these areas stripped from them is fraudulent. Common sense seems lost to time.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. Please refer to comment 181-3 for how we viewed the need to address this project and our process for evaluating the alternatives.
358-5	**Comment:** *Also the use of stiff environmental rules and shady invasive science to curtail everything from access, logging, hunting, fishing, industry. This would by design devastate small town northern economies. At the time I thought that idea was a long way off, that was eight years ago, and national forest access was one of the "bites of the cookie" that this plan included.* **Response:** The economic impacts of motorized use in Wisconsin are controversial (see Recreation report). We understand that people easily reach the conclusions you state in your comment. Unfortunately, we did not find any definitive conclusion that supports that our decision will result in an adverse economic effect to local economies. We found in our research that motor vehicle use can benefit both tourism and related dollars to local communities. However, we also found countering costs due to increased law enforcement needs and environmental damage. Finally, we found no evidence in our research that concentrating motorized use on fewer roads will reduce recreation overall. Please see Appendix A to this document for a discussion on the economic issue.

358-6	**Comment:** *I guess Wisconsin can look forward to annual California style forest fires and look don't touch wilderness policy. I understand the need to balance access but this plan is plainly biased in one direction and that alone should invalidate it.* **Response:** Thank you for highlighting this concern with us. Our decision addresses motor vehicle use for the general public. This is distinctly different from motor vehicle use that is needed to manage the natural resources of the National Forest. We term this type of use as "administrative." Given our decision's focus on general public use of motor vehicles, road access needed to manage an administrative us, such as fighting wildfires, will not be affected.
359-1	**Comment:** *Please leave the roads in the national and state forests in northern Wisconsin open to vehicle traffic. As an avid outdoorsman and land owner in the Lakewood area for over 30 years, I feel that things need to stay the way they are.* **Response:** Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the Forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the National Forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6, 800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered "unauthorized roads"–roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the National Forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people's need for that access.
359-2	**Comment***: I agree that dirt bikes and ATV should be kept on authorized trails, so should mountain bikes and horses. My concern is that old logging roads that are used by numerous hunters in the fall and during the rifle deer season will be locked out. I spend a lot of time in the woods and to be honest with you, I do not see the wide spread damage that is being blamed on vehicles.* **Response:** Hunters will continue to have non-motorized access on roads that are no longer open to public motor vehicle use. Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the Forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the National Forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6,800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered "unauthorized roads"–roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the National Forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people's need for that access.
359-3	**Comment:** *Please leave things the way they are. The State and National forests are for everyone. Paid for by everyone. Were created for recreational use for everyone. Not to mention the fact that the people that will be the most affected, the hunters and fisherman, bring the most to the surrounding communities in both financial and non financial ways. For example, 99% of the hunters in the woods obey the rules and will turn in the 1% that spoil it for everyone.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. Please refer to comment 359-1 for an explanation of the access opportunities that

	are still available to people.
360-1	**Comment:** *Upon reviewing the Travel Management Project Environmental Assessment prepared by your office, I urge you to adopt Alternative 1.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comments 181-3 for our explanation why choosing Alternative 1 would be an irresponsible choice.
360-2	**Comment:** *For starters, I believe, in preparing the Assessment, you did not take into account motorized recreational activities other than ATVs and highway legal vehicles, and, therefore, have omitted a large body of potential stakeholders. I own and operate a 4x4 vehicle that is not street legal and is used solely in a recreational manner. There are precious few opportunities for off-road enthusiasts like me in Wisconsin, and the Assessment didn't do anything to take this into account.* **Response:** We acknowledge that the Travel Management Rule defines what an off-highway vehicle is (see page 4 of the EA for this definition). However, our 2004 Forest Plan prohibits street legal vehicle use off roads open to public use. Our decision distinguishes which roads and trails are available for either highway legal vehicles and/or all-terrain vehicles. Unfortunately, vehicles that are not street legal are not allowed for use on the National Forest.
360-3	**Comment:** *In addition, Alternatives 2 and 3 effectively eliminate access for a wide range of other forest users like birdwatchers, hunters, fishermen and other outdoor enthusiasts. It seems to me that, in order to appease a certain type of user, the Alternatives penalize a large variety others*. **Response:** We understand that our decision may affect how people use the National Forest. We can help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We also can direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences, easy access, and the sense of remoteness. We are committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking.
361-1	**Comment:** *In this assessment the only alternative we can agree to at this point would be alternative one. This alternative gives the most available use to the Forest to HLV's. While the maps still do not include all the existing roads/trails currently out there, it is the best alternative offered. This alternative also gives users more variety of use and disperses use much more, leaving less impact on the forest.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comments 181-3 for our explanation why choosing Alternative 1 would be an irresponsible choice.
361-2	**Comment:** *A majority of National Forest lands are found near remote gateway communities that desperately need the economic support that HLV's bring into an area. We do not understand the statement that "economic impact" considered "non-significant". If roads/trails are not accessible, HLV's will not come to that area and the economic impact for the area is gone. The old saying*

	"build it and they will come" or in this case "keep it open and they will come" applies. **Response:** The economic impacts of motorized use in Wisconsin are controversial (see Recreation report). We understand that people easily reach the conclusions you state in your comment. Unfortunately, we did not find any definitive conclusion that supports that our decision will result in an adverse economic effect to local economies. We found in our research that motor vehicle use can benefit both tourism and related dollars to local communities. However, we also found countering costs due to increased law enforcement needs and environmental damage. Please see Appendix A to this document for a more detailed discussion on the economic issue. Miles of roads associated with government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) total approximately 4,500 miles, many of which are located near gateway communities. Our decision does not affect public motor vehicle use on these roads. When combined with the road miles in our decisions, HLV users will have approximately 6,800 miles available for their use. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered "unauthorized roads"–roads that are low standard, remote, and located far away from any gateway community.
361-3	**Comment:** *Even though as an organized group we are quite small we actually represent a much larger group of recreationists who need area to "four wheel". The recent State of Wisconsin surveys for SCORP (State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan) showed at least 736,000 4WD's (HLV's) used for off road four wheel driving in Wisconsin. There are many interests that rely on their Four Wheel Drive vehicle to get out in the forest to recreate in addition to just four wheeling per se, such as bird watching, hunting, fishing, flower and other wildlife observing etc.* **Response:** Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the Forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the National Forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6,800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered "unauthorized roads"–roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the National Forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people's need for that access.
361-4	**Comment:** It *is a recognized fact that there is a larger aging population of which many are having a more and more difficult time of accessing these properties without the assistance of a vehicle and have more time to be out in the forest.* **Response:** We appreciate your perspective on how our decision will affect you. We understand that many of our Forest users are aging and not as capable to use the Forest as they have in the past. Our decision will still provide approximately 6,800 miles of road for public motor vehicle use when you add in the roads under township, county, and State jurisdiction. We believe this provides ample access for people so they enjoy the outdoors on the National Forest while also addressing the environmental impacts that arise from this use.

361-5	**Comment:** *There are also more and more people that wish to "get away from it all" due to the high pressure of their jobs etc. The need for access to such environments as the National Forests is more and more becoming a necessity. It seems incongruous to close off more property that is needed more than ever by a large segment of the very people who own and need that type of environment. National Forests should be kept accessible to as many people as possible for all the various interests and uses that a forest has available to people.* **Response:** We welcome all people to the National Forest. We encourage people to contact us to discuss the type of experience they are seeking (fishing, dispersed camping, solitude, etc.) and the type of vehicle they would like to use for that experience. We will help people locate an area that best suits their recreational needs. Our decision will still provide approximately 6,800 miles of road for public motor vehicle use when you add in the roads under township, county, and State jurisdiction. We believe this provides ample access for people so they enjoy the outdoors on the National Forest while also addressing the environmental impacts that arise from this use.
361-6	**Comment:** *I strongly urge you to allow accessibility to ALL roads/trails no matter what level of road/trail it is. The level of roads that you believe cannot be maintained must be left open. The lower classified roads would not need to be maintained but could be accessed by the public with their motorized vehicles. These are the very roads that seem to be the main target for closure and yet in most cases are the most desirable for our activity. Leaving these areas open would also disperse the usage and, therefore, create less impact. By limiting more and more where HLV's can go creates more use on those areas that are available and a less desirable atmosphere for many of us who enjoy "getting away from it" and exploring what is out there and also creates even more of the usage damages you are trying to alleviate. Many times all that happens when closures occur is that the responsible four wheelers will stay out but those who are not responsible will find their way back into those areas and as already has been proven "enforcement" is very difficult. Bottom line is that ALL low roads/trails should be left open to HLV's except in exceptional cases in order to disperse usage and allow for a more variable experience to us users (the public).* **Response:** Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the Forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the National Forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6,800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. We believe this avoids forcing people into smaller areas to use motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered “unauthorized roads”–roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the National Forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people’s need for that access.
361-7	**Comment:** *It would also seem that in light of what has been learned about all the run-a-way forest fires recently that closing any roads would not be realistic. Comments have been made several times that if there would have been more "roads" into some of these areas, they could have saved much of the forests and the homes in the forests.* **Response:** Thank you for highlighting this concern with us. Our decision addresses motor vehicle use for the general public.

	This is distinctly different from motor vehicle use that is needed to manage the natural resources of the National Forest. We term this type of use as “administrative.” Given our decision’s focus on general public use of motor vehicles, road access needed to manage an administrative us, such as fighting wildfires, will not be affected. Please note that most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered “unauthorized roads”–roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the National Forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people’s need for that access.
361-8	**Comment***: Hopefully, we can continue to work together in the future to further better trails/roads that include HLV's--Highway/Off Highway (Four Wheel Drive) vehicles such as jeeps, trucks etc. and if any of the National Forest Travel Management Rule group is interested in joining us on a ride, we can surely accommodate.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; we appreciate all public input and partnering you have provided on this project. We look forward to our continued collaboration in providing access to the National Forest.
361-9	**Comment:** *On a more personal note, I have three children who grew up four wheeling with us in our Jeep. We have been out in many different areas and have seen things we would not have had the opportunity to see any other way. They have grown up with a respect and appreciation for the outdoors and nature that we are quite proud of. They also have become pretty good drivers that we attribute to the challenging driving skills needed to traverse some of the low standard "roads" they have run.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your experiences and how your conscientious use contributes to that experience.
362-1	**Comment***: After reviewing the various restrictive options I believe that option one will cause the least impact to the way my family and I enjoy the forest. We camp, hunt, fish, pick berries, and enjoy exploring all via 4x4 vehicle. I have been doing this type of activity in the Nicolet since I was thirteen years old, thirty seven years ago! My parents did it prior to that and our elderly neighbor in Townsend, WI, now deceased, even prior to that. Our choice of exploration is an old Jeep and option one, despite a drastic decrease in available places to drive it, is the option that reduces our activities the least. We still favor an "Open Unless Posted Closed" policy but apparently this option was taken off the table at the national level some time ago. It's shameful because that practice puts the burden of proof on the recreationists rather than common sense as far as what constitutes a "road". To repeat, option one is our preferred option, but definitely not the best one.* **Response:** Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the Forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the National Forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6,800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered “unauthorized roads”–roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the National Forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people’s need for that access. We have found that posting routes as “open” or “closed” has not always been effective in controlling motor vehicle use. Plus,

	signs have also proven difficult to maintain and are continually subject to vandalism. Given the larger number of roads on the National Forest, requiring each undesignated route and area to be posted as "closed" would be unreasonable.
363-1	**Comment:** *As a member of the 4 Lakes 4 Wheelers based in Madison I am encouraging a vote for Alternative 1 of the Travel Management Project Environmental Assessment.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comments 181-3 for our explanation why choosing Alternative 1 would be an irresponsible choice.
364-1	**Comment:** *Please be advised that as a Federal and State of Wisconsin concerned tax payer, we herein urge you to adopt Alternative 1 of the three travel management plans that are proposed.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comments 181-3 for our explanation why choosing Alternative 1 would be an irresponsible choice.
365-1	**Comment:** *All unauthorized roads within the Chequamegon National Forest should be closed. All unauthorized roads by McLaren Lake should be closed. All unauthorized roads within the Chequamegon National Forest Old Growth Forest by Lower Clam Lake and McLaren Lake should be closed.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Only one motorized access into McLaren Lake has been authorized via FR 1266A and W224239. This access is closed to ATVs. With the exception of FR 1265 and FR 1275, ATV access is closed in the immediate vicinity of McLaren Lake.
366-1	**Comment:** *The U.S. Forest Service needs to take steps to stop the soil damage, erosion of the McLaren Lake boat landing, reduction in water quality, and the destruction of forest vegetation by the misuse and illegal use of motorized vehicles in the Old Growth Forest by McLaren Lake and Lower Clam Lake in the Chequamegon National Forest.* **Response:** Your desire to stop illegal motorized use and its associated resource damage in the McLaren Lake and Lower Clam Lake area is shared by the Forest Service. Illegal use is hard to control. We will continue to periodically monitor this area.
367-1	**Comment:** *I would like to voice my opinion on the Chequamegon Nicollet forest trails. I believe that all public land should remain open to the public. It doesn't matter if it is for motorized or nonmotorized use. Government land is not owned by the government, it is owned by the people. And as it is owned by the people, the people should have full access to it and decide where and how each group should use it.* **Response:** All National Forest land is open for public access; please see response to comments 181-3 and 241-1.
368-1	**Comment:** *Since 1980 I've been a member of various four wheel drive clubs across the Midwest and now that I'm living in Wisconsin I'm proud to be part of the 4 Lakes 4 Wheel Drive Club. Not only do they promote responsible enjoyment of the great camaraderie and family time our sport affords, they are affiliated with the Wisconsin Four Wheel Drive Association as well as the*

	United Four Wheel Drive Association who likewise endeavor to make this important recreational activity accessible to current and future generations. Please know that I feel very deeply about the questions now before you and hope you will act in support of Alternative 1 which provides for 4,086 miles to ride on. As a responsible career professional and the father of four daughters I can assure you that we treat the land and the laws with respect - in return we expect to see these resources continue to be available. I appreciate your efforts and attention in this urgent matter - please feel free to contact me directly should you have questions or if I can be of any assistance. **Response:** Thank you for sharing how you utilize the National Forest and its importance to you and your family; please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are implementing this change.
369-1	**Comment:** *Although I am for having no motorized traffic in our national forests, this is not on the table at this time. Therefore I support your proposal to protect our northern forests and their ecosystems by closing 55% of the forest to motorized traffic. We need to balance the needs of individuals who enjoy both motorized and/or silent recreation. Even more we need to preserve the qualities we seek in a forest for future generations to enjoy. Preserving that quality means limiting motorized access to the forests. I support the second alternative for forest roads presented to the public in October, 2007. The second alternative has the least mileage open to traffic in the forests while maintaining access for hunting, bough & firewood gathering, recreation, and to private holdings. Most of the roads to be closed are small and virtually inaccessible, or the areas are already connected by state, county, and city roads*. **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We believe the decision provides the balance you have suggested. Please see response to comment 185-1.
369-2	**Comment:** *Forest roads and motorized traffic bring with them a number of negative consequences: spread of invasive species, damage to plant life and animal habitat, breaking up of continuous tracts that are necessary to the survival of some species, damage to wetlands and other environmentally sensitive areas, and the loss of the peace and quiet that many of us seek when we spend time in our forests. A healthy forest can support only so many roads. Please hold firm to your proposal to protect our northern forests by closing 55% of them to motorized traffic. The second alternative road proposal (October, 2007) is the closest to this needed protection. The other alternative proposals are not acceptable. Thank you for this opportunity for public input.* **Response:** We believe the decision provides a balance of access. The Roads Analysis Process we utilized and will continue to utilize is a tool to access when a road may cause negative consequences that are unacceptable if a road were to be left open.
370-1	**Comment:** *I am a responsible OHV enthusiast here in Wisconsin, myself and entire family enjoys this sport. Just want to tell you that we support Alternative 1 (no action) after reviewing this EA.* **Response:** Thank you for taking the time to review the EA and provide your comments; please see response to comment 181-3.
371-1	**Comment:** *The reason so few comments have been received from users of Forest Roads: I suspect that most people do not know the road numbers of the roads they use, just that they use them. Most people will not know that they used a road on the*

	maps provided until there is a closed sign on the road. If I understand correctly, if this is the case, one may ask that the use of "that road" may be reconsidered on an annual basis. **Response:** We are using an adaptive management approach to travel management and will accept proposals for additions (and deletions) to the MVUM annually. We look forward to working with you and others with this adaptive management MVUM process as outlined in Appendix B of the Decision Notice.
371-2	**Comment:** *Snowmobilers and ATVs should never be on the same trail at the same time. Preferably they would never use the same trail even at different times of the year.* **Response:** The regulations concerning snowmobile and ATV use on the same trail (and time period) vary by trail (and jurisdiction over the trail).
372-1	**Comment:** *I live outside the state of Wisconsin. The majority of the time, my husband and I ride our snowmobiles in the Lakewood/Townsend area of Wisconsin. We also ride some in the UP of Michigan. I receive the Blue Ribbon Coalition magazine and was still unaware of the forest plan until the magazine I received just this week and an article that my mother, who lives in Wisconsin, recently sent me from the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel concerning motorized access to forest roads...I would like to comment on the following comments from that article: "But all parties agree that the public at large seems to know little about the plan. "I don't know if it's apathy or general lack of information," observed Schnorr. Tony Erba, deputy forest supervisor for the Chequamegon Nicolet, said." Because of info I received from the Blue Ribbon Coalition, I went to the NFS website mentioned in the MJS article. I have been receiving NFS info from the state of Michigan and was receiving info from the Ashland/Bayfield area and from MN. I have found the info received very difficult to interpret as I do not actually live in the areas, so I understand completely why very few have commented on the plan. This is the problem: I have NO idea what roads we ride on when we snowmobile. I have no idea how I would even find the roads in the summer so that I could comment on them for snowmobile use. The WI, MI, and MN plans and maps are very difficult to understand unless you actually live in the area. It would be very helpful if the snowmobile trails were overlaid on the maps. I am sure that for ATV riders the same is true (continued in comment -2.* **Response:** This decision will not affect snowmobile use. The project is strictly focused on public wheeled motorized vehicle use. We're sorry if our documents are hard to understand. Please contact the Forest directly with any questions.
372-2	**Comment***: (Continued from comment -1) A good way to have helped everyone who rides trails would have been (last year...too late now) to have the snowmobile/ATV clubs mark on their trail maps the roads that would be soon closed if no comments concerning use of roads was reported to you by a certain date...or even to put maps in stops frequented by snowmobilers or at motels so that people might be able to understand what roads were to be no longer available. One definite comment I have about snowmobiles and ATVs: they should NEVER be on the same trail at the same time as is currently the practice in Langlade county. I wish I could have made more specific comments, but I think that the above explains why you have not heard more comments.* **Response:** The regulations concerning snowmobile and ATV use on the same trail (and time period) vary by trail (and

	jurisdiction over the trail). Please note that snowmobile access is not affected by this project and ATV trail access has increased.
373-1	**Comment:** *The non gas tax roads that I ride; 430, 511, 512, 523, 530, 536, 643, 1133, and would like to explore in the future, 135 and 912, appear to remain open to HLV's on all Alternatives to the TMR.* **Response:** FR 430, FR 511, FR 512, FR 523, FR 530, FR 536, and FR 643 are identified for hlv and atv in the selected alternative due to moderate or high public value relative to resource risks associated with the roads. FR 1133 is currently closed, therefore it is outside the scope of this project and not considered for motorized access.
373-2	**Comment***: My family and I also enjoy hiking and snowshoeing on the trails in the wilderness area on the north end of Round Lake, I am glad the Forest Service has that much shoreline on Round Lake protected from development.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing how your family uses the Forest.
373-3	**Comment:** *For me the issues are riding opportunities and access to the National Forest. Of the three alternatives available in the TMR, I support Alternative 1 because it provides the greatest amount of riding opportunity. I realize a lot of the roads that are slated to close are very short and may be very over-grown with vegetation and do not provide a quality OHV type experience. But the issue I have with Alternative 2 and 3 is that approximately 2,500 miles of roads are being closed and although the CNNF Forest Plan allows up to 100 miles of additional ATV trails on the Chequamegon side, I am not aware of any proposals to establish these additional sustainable OHV trails in the near future. I would certainly support Alternative 2 or 3 if more loops or networks of trail were established. The demand for OHV and single track motorcycle trail is certainly strong, greater than the 100 additional miles allowed for on the Chequamegon side. I believe OHV trails are needed on the Nicolet side also because of the close proximity of a large population of people between Green Bay, Appleton, and Milwaukee.* **Response:** We are continuing the process of evaluating opportunities for ATV trail development on the Nicolet side of the Forest. Roads that will become unavailable for motor vehicle use on the MVUM will still be available for consideration for trail development until more site-specific analysis and decisions are made. If you are interested in being added to the mailing list for ATV trail development projects please contact the District Office.
374-1	**Comment:** *My name is Rob Stafsholt and in my precious time inside the borders of the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest I am a bear hunter, bobcat hunter, houndsman, trapper, archery deer hunter, gun deer hunter, grouse hunter, bough picker, coyote hunter, environmentalist, a property owner, father of a little girl who loves the Forest, a wildlife conservationist, trout fisherman, taxpayer, and even occasionally a berry picker amongst other activities. As I consider the above activities, not one of them is excluded from a negative impact from Alternative 2 or Alternative 3. Please see to it that Alternative 1 is passed.* **Response:** Thank you for letting us know how you use the Forest. Each of the alternatives reflects a compromise between resource use and resource protection. We believe the decision is the best balance between these needs. Additionally, please see response to comment 181-3.

374-2	**Comment:** *I spend an enormous amount of my recreational and family time near Clam Lake, WI. My father started taking me there in the fall of 1976, significant because I was born in 1975. I made my first family bear hunting trip at the age of 8 months old and have not missed one season since. I have witnessed a lot of changes in the past 30 years. Pine martin reintroductions, deer populations soar, Forest lands harvested for timber but managed for the good and promotion of a multitude of species of wildlife and plant life. An elk herd was brought in and released so they may now live in the Forest. Timber wolves have been managed to be plentiful these days and were nonexistent in Clam Lake not so many years ago. As I consider the ramifications of closing roads and making access nonexistent to these assets, along with the previously existing ones that still thrive, I ask one simple question: What good are any of these assets if the great majority of citizens don't have access to enjoy these wonderful, tax funded endeavors? NONE!* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your life long experiences. We agree that people should have the ability to enjoy all of the assets you have highlighted in your letter. We appreciate the time you took to review the many roads near your cabin. We did follow your tour via a map. We suggest that it would be best to meet with you and look at these roads together so that we can get a better sense of which roads you are most concerned with as well as discuss the rationale for some of the current road closures. The travel management decision allows for continuous public input and future changes to road designations. The travel management map will be updated annually.
374-3	**Comment:** *My cabin is on FR 195. I took a drive yesterday to visualize the impact of the road closings on the map I obtained for Alternative 2 for my area. The section to the north of my cabin is bordered for approximately 6 miles by FR 182. I began on the west end of FR 182 and went east. The first significant trail I came to was about a mile and half from the intersection (by significant I mean any trail wide enough for a highway legal vehicle and at least a half mile in length). This trail is labeled on your map as 182C on the south side of FR 182 no label north of FR 182 on your map. This trail goes in and travels northwest for approximately 1.6 miles. I do not have highway legal vehicle access to that trail because the first 200 yards of it is comingled with an ATV trail before the ATV trail heads east. Approximately 1.5 miles in my travels east on FR 182, I come to a trail with no number, it is not even on your map because it is narrow and grown in, grown in you see because the half mile trail to the north used to intercept the ATV trail so a berm was made on the end of it many years ago. I don't have access to that trail anymore. I continue on and in a half mile or so I reach the Foot Travel Only gate on a couple mile long trail heading south not on your map either amazingly. A few hundred yards later there is a great trail providing access to the heart of the south half of this grand section, not to mention a private cabin on the south side of the creek. This trail is marked on your map as 1333, and it will be closed for Foot Travel Only according to your map. I attended a meeting last year at Lakewoods Resort and asked the gentleman from the Forestry who was in charge why that road was to be closed. He told me it was relatively near some biologically significant trees and that they had had a couple people travel down the ATV trail off this 1333 trail (continued in comment -4)* **Response:** We appreciate the time you took to review the many roads near your cabin. We did follow your tour via a map. We suggest that it would be best to meet with you and look at these roads together so that we can get a better sense of which roads you are most concerned with as well as discuss the rationale for some of the current road closures. The travel management decision allows for continuous public input and future changes to road designations. The travel management map will be updated

	annually. (Note: this response covers 374-3 through 374-9)
374-4	**Comment:** *(Continued from comment -3) My opinion is that near is not in and a gate on the ATV trail would alleviate any enforcement issues. Let's enforce, not close in lieu of lack of enforcement. When I asked if the cabin owners would be allowed a special right of access to the Forest because they owned land in the middle of it, the gentleman told me I was wrong and there was a cabin on the north side of that creek that feeds McCarthy Lake. He was right, there is we will get to their Foot Travel Only class 5 gravel driveway in a minute. For the record I would be happy to show Mr. Forestry (whose name I honestly can't remember) the cabin I talk about with southern access anytime.* **Response:** Please see response to 374-3
374-5	**Comment:** *Back to my trip around the block, as I continue east on FR 182 and before I reach the intersection of FR 347 there is another bermed trail heading north that is hard to see since it's access was stripped so long ago. Now I get to the FR 347 intersection and to the north is a gated trail that is gated for the ATV trail that is comingled for the first 25 yards before the ATV trail bends west, thus leaving another mile long potential highway legal trail inaccessible and sitting quietly growing in. Heading east about a half mile is a trail going south that used to be a Foot Travel Only gated trail but now has been opened up for ATV's no access for vehicles. Proceeding east up and over the little hill I find a Foot Travel Only trail on the south side hmmmm not on your map. I would think the general public looking at this would think perhaps closing a road or two for Foot Travel Only trails would be a good idea, as I would agree, except there are lots of those trails, just not on your map for them to see and realize. That trail, by the way, is not used by the walking grouse hunters anymore as they tell me since you guys quit driving in there nobody cuts the trees and it is tough job to walk through them all?? Shortly thereafter I find 1821 that is open to drive to the south on, thank you, especially since it is the first one in my journey. It's probably going to look like the parking lot at a popular boat ramp on fishing opener on opening day of deer season (continued in comment -6)* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. There are approximately 20,000 road entries in the CNNF data bases to confirm, this is an enormous task. Accurate road information on the road network is always appreciated. Please see response to 374-3
374-6	**Comment:** *(Continued from comment -5) Turning north on FR 183, a half mile in I come to an old logging trail that will take you all the way to the big green swamp if you ride your ATV since there is no access for highway legals. Going north there is a bermed road on the west side of the road that accesses miles of trail I could drive on but it touches the ATV trail somewhere and therefore I am not allowed access. It is not on your map. I now find a road on your map 183EA, it is highway legal accessible for a half mile in length that parallels the main road of 183.* **Response:** Please see response to 374-3
374-7	**Comment:** *Turn the corner staying on FR 183, about a mile up I find the driveway for the cabin mentioned above. It is 1334 on your map and the gate is about 20 feet up the trail gating off a 1.5 to 2 mile section of trail on Forest land before the private land for that cabin starts. Sure would be nice to have access to drive in and take my father, age 67, grouse hunting for a couple hours some afternoon but we don't have access. I travel up FR 183 farther and come to a proposed road closing on your map*

	numbered 183C. I travel this trail weekly, gets me into a great hunting spot about two miles in won't be able to go there under Alternative 2 (continued in comment -8). **Response:** Please see response to 374-3
374-8	**Comment:** *On the opposite side of the road is 183B, also to be closed. This trail I also travel on a weekly basis to access a large beaver pond and creek system. The road doesn't go to the creek though, about a quarter mile away is as close as it gets. I asked Mr. Forestry in Lakewoods that night why close such a great trail, here is what he said "I don't know if you know it or not, but there is a pair of swans nesting at the intersection of these two creeks here." "Really?" I said as if I hadn't watched them a half a dozen times both of the past two summers. He continued, "Yep, they travel down this creek and go into this little lake here. We don't want them to get disturbed." Now, I like swans. I think they are beautiful creatures, but as Mr. Forestry showed me with his pencil how they traveled up the creek to what is known as McCarthy Lake, he didn't seem to mention the fact that they had to swim directly under the bridge on FR 183, a highly traveled fire road in the area. I did mention to him that the Foot Travel Only Trail on the opposite side of the bridge goes in more than a mile to a little peninsula. He said he thought I was wrong there too, that there was a Foot Travel Only trail on the south side of the road, he is right again, there is one that goes almost two miles in to McCarthy Lake. That's right the only access to this Forestry Asset is by foot, that's okay, at least it is on the map labeled as such right? Wrong neither of those Foot Travel Only trails is on the Travel Management Map! The one he didn't know about, by-the-way, is where I observed the swans since the peninsula where the trail ends is about 25 feet from their nest. My opinion is that me driving a minimum of a quarter mile off that creek, farther where the nest is, is not nearly as intrusive to these birds as an eighteen wheeler of logs rumbling over their heads on the 4 foot high bridge or people walking up and camping 25 feet from the nest. That is not using common sense to put it nicely* **Response:** Please see response to 374-3
374-9	**Comment:** *(Continued from comment -8) Traveling north on FR 183 there are two roads that are gated, only one is on the map, 183F, which on the map is about a mile of highway legal access. However, the reality is that this trail goes to private land and the gate is way out by the road so there is no access like it shows on the map. The second, 285, is a Foot Travel Only trail a little north of 183F, also gated right at the main road and again not on the Travel Map. We have now traveled 6 miles on the south end of the section, and 8 miles up the east side, there were two trails, one on the south and one on the east side, that allowed for user access and they are both on the slate to be closed. There are no roads at all on the north road which is FR 184, except for one that goes into the section to the north - 865 that is also slated to be closed off too. The west road is County Road GG. Just south of where FR 387 hits GG, there is a Foot Travel Only Trail going into the east also not on the map. A little south of that is a Road Closed gate on a trail going to private land. Just north of the Spider Lake road to the west is the last trail in our section to the east. It is marked 853 on your map and appears to be open to highway legal access, but I found it has a berm on it a hundred yards in or so. I realize that my drive around the section is long winded; I hope you took the time to read it and actually look up the information. I am very, very concerned that in an era of shrinking hunter populations, where one of the main reasons (on surveys) is accessibility to hunting land, that we would even dare to consider closing any access at all.*

	Response: Please see response to 374-3
374-10	**Comment:** *I am very, very concerned that in an era of shrinking hunter populations, where one of the main reasons (on surveys) is accessibility to hunting land, that we would even dare to consider closing any access at all.* **Response:** We want to ensure there is adequate access for hunting and other activities in the Forest. We will continue to evaluate all roads throughout the update process. We understand that a reduction in available roads is one of many factors that can influence hunter success (for deer, bear, grouse, or turkey). However, our decision does not affect the hunting opportunity on the CNNF – our decision may change the means of transportation from a motor vehicle to foot or bicycle, but not the ability to access the forest. Thus, our decision does not affect hunting availability on the forest, but rather the means to access hunting opportunities on the forest. Regarding hunting participation declines in the State, this is affected by many complex factors beyond road access to the national forest: • aging population • lack of private land access • cost • urbanizing population • loss of habitat to urbanization • abundance of other youth activities • lack of available mentors
374-11	**Comment***: What about the handicapped that are forced to remain in a vehicle or near one. Why shouldn't they have the access those of us who are more mobile have? Older folks, young kids, my daughter, they should all have the ability to see the Forest and its assets? All of its assets not just the ones on the main road.* **Response:** Please see response to 180-1 regarding access for disabled persons. Access for all users is important. We will continue to provide a balance of access for Forest users. If there are specific areas of interest, please let us know.
374-12	**Comment:** *What good is all the work for pine martins if I can't access an area to show their tracks to a future generation? If the future generations can't see the elk because they couldn't access them they will not value them, with no value comes no protection.* **Response:** Core populations of both marten and elk are found on the Great Divide District. Impacts from motorized recreation on these populations were considered during the analysis process. Several open roads traverse habitat of both of these animals. Only a few roads were closed (most only seasonally) in elk calving areas. Several elk viewing areas have been developed specifically to provide opportunities to see elk. In addition elk can be commonly seen along roadways throughout the Clam Lake area. Because of the limited size of the population, marten are difficult to see. However, many open roads exist within marten habitat.

374-13	**Comment***: I spend much time bear hunting with hounds and training hounds in the Forest around Clam Lake. There is limited access now, as I pointed out above, and if you close roads so there is no access to the center of some of these large blocks of Forest I will not reasonably be able to hunt here. I will eventually give up and go somewhere where it is easier. Somewhere where someone else already hunts, runs their ATV, bird dogs for grouse, whatever we will be crowded and have user group conflicts. That would be an awful shame we the people would not be able to use our Forest*. **Response:** Many of the low standard unauthorized roads will be closed during this process. We encourage you to let us know which of these roads you use to bear hunt and train hounds. We will consider opening these roads during our annual update of the travel management map.
374-14	**Comment:** *In your documents I see that the economic impact in the local communities is 'non-significant' issue. I suggest you reconsider the scope of the EA and really think about the Forest and how it is financed, where tax dollars come from, what user groups spend the dollars to be taxed and without the user groups in those communities, where the people to tax will come from.* **Response:** The economic impacts of motorized use are controversial (see Recreation report). In addition, there is no evidence that concentrating motorized use on fewer roads will reduce recreation overall. However, we understand the concerns and will continue to work with you and others to provide a mix of access to ensure adequate access for hunting. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
375-1	**Comment***: I am writing in support of the proposed road closures in the Chequamegon-Nicolet Forest. We need to protect what small areas of forest land we have left from the destruction motorized vehicles. Our natural resources have already been abused and diminished from human interventions and I truly believe it us up to us to stop it before it's too late. It's not like new forests are growing anymore so we need to be careful with the ones we have left. There are many supporters of silent sports that need to be heard. Please hear us and make a stand for the proposed road closures.* **Response:** We will continue to provide a balance of access for Forest users. Thank you for sharing your concerns.
376-1	**Comment:** *I would like to comment on the Travel Management Rule (TMR) for the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest (CNFF) proposal. AMA sanctioned events in Wisconsin include motorcycle dual-sport rides that rely heavily on the Forest Service roads as part of the routes. A dual-sport ride combines road riding with off-road riding. In addition, recreational trail rides and family outings use the Forest Service roads. In examining the different proposals in the TMR environmental assessment I would prefer Option 1 over the other two options presented. Option 1 retains the most mileage of the different types of roads as defined by the USFS. My interests in these are using them on our street legal dual-sport on/off road motorcycles and allow for use by 'Jeep type' 4 wheel drive vehicles. Because of a lack of a registration program in Wisconsin for OHM and 4X4 vehicles we have very few miles of trails in the state; about 50 miles of single track for the OHM riders and 7 miles of trails for the 4X4 vehicle (the Pipeline). The OHM are allowed on some ATV trails in the state, but outside of USFS land the bikes are not included in the definition of an ATV. Thus it's up to the individual counties to allow or disallow the dirt bikes use on their ATV trails. Recent loss of*

	ATV trails to non-street legal dirt bikes in Jackson County only exasperates and emphasizes the problem of a general lack of OHM trails in the state. **Response:** Events such as the motorcycle dual-sport ride are authorized by a special use permit. Even if a road is unavailable to public motorized use through this project, it should not affect the event as one time uses of closed roads can be authorized through the permit process. Our decision increases the miles of roads available to ATVs by 71 miles and the miles of trails by 16 miles. It is recommended that if you have any specific roads that you would like to see remain open these should be submitted for analysis and a decision would be made in the future updates to the MVUM.
376-2	**Comment:** *Off Highway Motorcycle riders are working on a registration program for off-highway motorcycles so we can establish funding for OHM specific trails. The Jeep/4X4 drivers are doing a separate program to address their needs. But passing and adopting the registration programs will take time and building any new trails will take even longer. NEPA is not an easy process to go through. Losing trails and forest roads through the TMR process will not help at this time as the OHV riding community grows and needs more trails than we currently have access to. There is a need in Wisconsin for additional trails due to the growth in OHV use. This growth can in part be managed by partnering with the OHV community. We want to add OHM single track trails and loops, additional ATV trails to connect the various systems in the state, create some challenging truck/Jeep trails (rock crawls plus trails of various difficulties). Part of the answer to meeting these needs is to get clubs to adopt existing trails, help create and build new trails, and adopt these trails and help in their maintenance, all in partnership with the appropriate state and federal agencies. There are a number of examples of clubs partnering with state entities to do just this. If there are no local clubs then the state OHV associations will have to step up and help start local clubs where there are none (continued in comment -3)* **Response:** This project addresses the use on existing roads and trails. New trails are outside the scope and would need to be addressed through project level planning and a site specific environmental analysis. It is recommended that if you have specific roads that you would like to see remain open these should be submitted for analysis and a decision would be made on the future updates to the MVUM.
376-3	**Comment***: (Continued from comment -2) I have ridden off road motorcycles in Arkansas, Colorado, Utah and Tennessee. In each of these states I was able to purchase a sticker that enabled me to ride on miles and miles of recreational trails. The fee was modest ($15 to $30). In each case the land managers looked to see if Wisconsin had a similar registration program. If Wisconsin had a registration program the fee would be waived. Wisconsin tourism already benefits from an active off-road trail riding community. We could benefit more by attracting out-of-state riders and providing a place to ride. In my travels to other states for trail riding I was part of a group of about 10 riders. Keeping the 'roads' available for recreational use expands the ability of Wisconsin to attract tourists. There is a new class of 'utility vehicle' that must also be taken into account. These 'UTV' or 'LUV' vehicles are showing up in growing numbers and it would be beneficial to add them to the definition of ATV. A registration program for these vehicles is also in development in order to make funds available for trail development and maintenance.* **Response:** The Forest's definition of an ATV mirrors the state's definition and UTVs do not fall within the state's definition of an ATV. UTVs are not allowed on state roads or trails at this time other than on a trial basis in a few northern counties. The Forest

	will monitor the state's handling of UTVs in the future and we may consider allowing UTVs at that time. Evidence does not support that concentrating motorized use reduces recreation use overall. The opportunity to charge a fee for motorized trails is a possibility which we have chosen not to enact at this time; the State manages an ATV vehicle registration fee. Through partnership with the State, we now receive a portion of these funds through grants for specific work on specific motorized trails.
376-4	**Comment:** *We don't like seeing existing roads closed; once they are gone it's hard to get them back or get replacement miles. We recognize the USFS has limited resources to maintain all of them. But the trails not being maintained at this time should still be available; they are still being used even if sporadically, and they still remain useful to potential users. Hunters and others already help keep them in use even if they are only used sporadically during the hunting season or to get to favorite fishing sites. If we lose them now then we may have lost them for years to come with little chance for replacement. I'm worried that because of staffing and funding issues and despite the best of intentions that we would have little action and a general lack of response from the USFS if we close down existing roads and then ask for more trails in the future. NEPA can be a daunting and expensive process to go through for any new trail requests and as a reality check the process potentially becomes difficult when dealing with groups with different views*. **Response:** We will continue a process to evaluate all roads site specifically so you can expect the map to change over time. We will utilize the RAP to conduct this evaluation. In addition, we will consider any suggestions for additions or deletions in the updates to the MVUM annually.
376-5	**Comment:** *Option 2 is unacceptable because of the loss of trails and roads and no additional mileage. Option 3 has some merit because of the important increase in new ATV trails and roads added to the Eastern portion of the forest with the ongoing projects that appear on the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest April-June 2008 Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA). But the loss of 'road' mileage makes it unacceptable overall. We would propose that Option 1, with the addition of the new trails being developed in Option 3 would be the best overall solution. At some point the USFS also has to address the UTV/LUV issue, OHM single track trails, and 'Jeep / 4X4' needs. There are several State OHV associations that can be part of the solution.* **Response:** Thank you for expressing your concerns. We trust you will continue to work with us as we implement the Forest Plan for use a development of ATV trails on the eastside of the Forest. At this point in time we are not addressing UTVs; they are outside the scope of the CNNF TMR project (see EA).
377-1	**Comment:** *In taking this action, you help preserve some of the final places for 'natural quiet' and precious micro eco-systems within the forest so essential for those of us who enjoy and require places for stillness and silence. Looking back, I believe you will be proud of steps taken with this initiative to help preserve this precious resource for future generations. Thank you for the courage to take steps to help protect the Chequamegon-Nicolet Forest.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your thoughts. We are striving to strike a balance between motorized and non-motorized access needs. Hopefully as we continue this process you will be assured this balance is met.

378-1	**Comment:** *I am writing you in support of the new National Forest plan to restrict many roads in the forest to off-road vehicles. I previously wrote in support of restricting traffic ever further. My comments then were that some of the ATV trails were dead-end trails which went nowhere and did not connect to other trails. I still feel these trails should be eliminated. When the ATV riders get to the end of these dead-end roads, some will turn around and go back, but my experience has been that many will find this as an opportunity to go off trail--and then the damage begins! But, regardless of that critique, I highly favor the restrictions you are placing on off-road vehicle travel. We need to protect our environment, particularly woods and water, and this plan goes a long way toward that goal*. **Response:** Thank you for sharing your thoughts. We are striving to strike a balance between motorized and non-motorized access needs. Hopefully as we continue this process you will be assured this balance is met. Please note many hunters requested to keep the dead-end routes to provide motorized access into certain areas.
379-1	**Comment:** *I am strongly opposed to further traffic restrictions for the following reasons. Land that was removed from tax base for use by the public is restricted to use by very few. We live in an era where anything that is built or remodeled is required to be accessible to all, yet the proposed restrictions to travel eliminate use by many elderly, youth, handicapped, vets, and anyone not super fit. Roads that are restricted to walking only soon disappear completely. Enforcement of game and fish laws is nearly impossible where road access is limited. This gives violators more of an unfair advantage over law abiding sportsmen. Population control of wildlife is hindered by limiting sportsman access. We do not need to use public resources to maintain large tracts of forest and lake properties for the exclusive use by so called environmentalists from southern Wisconsin who don't want to use the forest and lakes or let anyone else use them. The use of off road vehicles definitely needs to be regulated and limited to reasonable use, but not eliminated. The restricting of lake access to walking in only, such as Big Brook and Anderson Lakes (not in proposal area) is a terrible waste of public resources that were set aside for use by all. Older folks that moved to northern Wisconsin to spend their time and money in the north woods are finding they may no longer drive into the forest. I strongly favor alternative 1 and strongly oppose alternative 2 of the proposed plan alternatives.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your thoughts. We are striving to strike a balance between motorized and non-motorized access needs. Hopefully as we continue this process you will be assured this balance is met.
380-1	**Comment:** *We are writing to express our support of you and the National Forest Planners for trying to close 55% of the national forest to motorized traffic. There is nothing more important than preserving our natural environment for future generations and this action is critical in accomplishing this. Motorized traffic, as we all know, is damaging to our forests. Let's keep forest trails safe for people who want to enjoy the quiet of nature, not the roar of a motorized vehicle*. **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
381-1	**Comment***: I'm writing to share my opinion on the possible closure of trails and roads in the forest. I am in favor of leaving everything open. Any closures will force people to use other roads, meaning heavier traffic on the remaining roads causing them to erode more than normal. I'm settling for option one, but am disappointed that that is the best choice. I use a Jeep to travel*

	through the forest and wish to be able to continue to go to all the places that I have in the past. **Response:** We encourage you to provide road-specific comments for consideration in our future updates to the MVUM. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice.
382-1	**Comment:** *Alternative number one please*. **Response:** Thank you for your comment; also please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why Alternative 1 was not chosen.
383-1	**Comment:** *I must say that proposal number one (1) is the only realistic way to go. The other two are simply too restrictive. The National forests are, after all, for use by a wide cross section of the tax paying public. There already seems to be a LOT of forest trails gated off as it is, so why close more? Walking in to hunt is one thing. Dragging a deer back out is another thing!* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; also please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why Alternative 1 was not chosen.
384-1	**Comment:** *In my opinion, the severe lack of motorized access for either ATVs or highway legal vehicles in either Alternative 2 (Forest Proposal) or Alternative 3 is a tremendous hardship for hunters who need that access to areas of the Forest that would now be forced to walk significant distances in potentially difficult weather conditions, especially during the late fall or early winter seasons. I believe that the proposals not only go too far to restrict access, but they have locked out the opportunity to enjoy all of the Forest in the way that it was meant to be. I love remote wilderness as much as anyone, but I cannot support a proposal that eliminates a significant portion of the woods from serious exploration and hunting potential, either by 4-wheeled drive vehicle or by ATV, especially as I get older.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 217-1.
384-2	**Comment:** *While your proposals are well researched and documented, they are unrealistic to enforce.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
385-1	**Comment:** *I'm opposed to the extensive closing of trails to vehicular traffic in the National Forest. A very limited closing would be acceptable, but not at the percent suggested.* **Response:** Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the national forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6, 800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered "unauthorized roads" – roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the national forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when

	we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people's need for that access.
385-2	**Comment***: Much of Wisconsin is way above population goals in deer management units. Closing access will keep hunters away from the regions of high deer populations are high. The deer damage to the ecosystems from high deer populations is much greater than done by vehicles, I believe.* **Response:** There are Deer Management Units on the CNNF that are under population goals, some are at goal, and others are above goal. It is recognized that one of the tools for managing the deer populations in Wisconsin is through hunting and that deer do impact tree regeneration, crop damage, and have other effects on the natural community. In our decision the roads available for motorized use increase the average distance that a hunter would have to walk in or haul bait or a deer stand but this potential increase is not expected to measurably affect the magnitude of impact that hunters have in determining the size of Wisconsin's deer population.
385-3	**Comment:** *Enjoying elk, wolves and other wildlife and ecosystems can best to accomplish by allowing visitors to drive through many areas of the forest. From what I've seen in Bayfield County, it is primarily the ATVs that are causing much of the erosion problem. Set some trails aside for ATVs but restrict ATVs from some other areas. The noise from an ATV is far greater than from a car or truck.* **Response:** Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the national forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6, 800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered "unauthorized roads" – roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the national forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people's need for that access.
386-1	**Comment:** *As an avid outdoor enthusiast, and off-road and Dual-sport motorcyclist, I have great interest in the motorized access allowed in our great national forest. I urge the forest service to not limit vehicle access more than it has been. Our forest network of lowly maintained vehicular accessible earthen access routes is used by many for recreational transportation in our beautiful forests. I support Alternative 1 and support its implementation.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 181-3.
386-2	**Comment***: I also would urge for the implementation of more off-road motorcycle single track type trails. These trails when properly implemented, can effectively be used, maintained, and co-exist with other forest users, with a low impact on forest health. The quality "forest experience", can and should be available to both motorized and non motorized users alike. Offroad motorcycling is a wonderful family activity enjoyed by many. Unfortunately there are far to few trail systems available in our state for the very high number of Wisconsin residents that enjoy off-road motorcycle riding. Trail system funding could be user funded thru a trail pass system, and soon to be implemented off-road motorcycle registration. Much like current snowmobile and ATV*

	programs. Construction and maintenance manpower thru user clubs and organizations. Our forests are a great asset to our state. Keep it accessible to vehicle access by implementing alternative #1 for the greatest access to our National forests. **Response:** The construction of new ATV trails is outside the scope of this particular decision; however, we will continue to propose and analyze projects in accordance with the Forest Plan. We encourage you to check the Anything Wisconsin and other websites or information sources for the locations of existing ATV riding opportunities in northern Wisconsin. Many of these opportunities occur on non-National Forest land.
386-3	**Comment:** *Please put me on your informational mailing list. Also I would like to make myself available to the forest service for any input or volunteer help on these matters. I have been an avid motorcyclist for 40 years.* **Response:** Thank you for the information and your willingness to volunteer.
387-1	**Comment:** *Our events rely upon Forest Service roads for a good portion of our route and we have worked with the Laona Forest Service office for the past eight years to obtain the proper permits we need for our rides. We also work with Langlade County, Marinette County and many private land owners to put together our temporary routes of up to 150 miles per day. We use primarily gas tax roads in the CNNF for our events, but have used what I believe to be roads 830311, 2640A, 2363B, 83345, 2138, 2640, and 2640B. From what I can tell on the maps for Alternative 2 and 3 none of these roads are slated for closure.* **Response:** 830311 and 83345 have been evaluated and identified for hlv use in the selected alternative. FR 2640A, FR 2363B, FR 2138, FR 2640, and FR 2640B are currently open and available for hlv use.
387-2	**Comment:** *First of all I would like to thank the Forest Service for managing ATV's and off-road motorcycles as the same by using the term OHV's. Because of this practice you have provided us riding opportunities such as the Flambeau Trail System and the Dead Horse Run System. The State of Wisconsin DNR does not have a registration program for off-road motorcycles so they are not permitted on DNR funded ATV trails. That is our problem, but we have a few very active people in the state that are working on a registration program for off-road motorcycles.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
387-3	**Comment:** *Of the three alternatives available in the TMR, our club would support Alternative 1 because it provides us with the greatest amount of available mileage; however we certainly do not view this alternative as a win-win situation for both our interest and the interest of those whom want to limit the amount of road mileage in the CNNF. The "CNNF Travel Management Frequently Asked Questions" document states "National Forests are used by the public for multiple purposes. When properly managed, OHV use is a legitimate use of National Forest System (NFS) lands. The intent of the proposed changes in OHV management on National Forests is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. These changes also allow for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation." The issue we have with Alternative 2 and 3 is that approximately 2,500 miles of roads are being closed and although the CNNF Forest Plan allows up to 100 miles of additional ATV trails on the Chequamegon side, I am not aware of any proposals to establish these additional sustainable OHV trails in the near future. Our*

	club could support Alternative 2 or 3 if more loops or networks of trail beyond the potential 100 miles were established. The TMR does not say if specific proposals for additional 100 miles of OHV trails exist or not. **Response:** We will continue to develop and propose projects for trail development. Please contact your local District Ranger Office for more information on these site-specific projects.
387-4	**Comment:** *If we could make recommendations for what type of trail would make a quality trail system, the Flambeau Trail System would be a very good example. The mileage is nice, at 60 miles, the terrain is varied with a lot of curves and turns, and facilities for food, gas, and camping are available. What is not needed is a large number of miles located on maintained gravel roads. This type of route does not make for a quality ridding experience. Gravel roads would be a good way to link different networks together, however. As motorcyclist our most revered type of trail is called "single track", it would most likely resemble a narrow hiking trail to the average person. This type of trail is not much wider than a motorcycle; ATV's would not fit on these trails. The ridding is slow and technical. A twenty mile single track loop would be of a nice length. Clark County has a 16 mile loop of single track, and about 20 miles is being developed at an OHV park on the Mole Lake Indian Reservation, other than that I am not aware of any other in the State of Wisconsin. The State of Michigan maintains over 900 miles of motorcycle single track trail. Some of this trail is located in the Ottawa, Hiawatha, and Manistee National Forest.* **Response:** Thank you for your suggestion regarding motorcycle trails. Motorcycles are considered in the EA along with ATVs (motorcycles less than 900 pounds are considered as ATVs). The 2004 Forest Plan does not specifically address single-track trails, but motorcycles are allowed on our ATV trails. The development of additional trails, loops, or connectors would be part of the site-specific project analysis at the Ranger District where the proposal would be located. The 2004 Forest Plan objectives include construction of additional ATV motorized trails. We welcome your participation and input on the future development of trails. The more specific the feedback the better we can accommodate your needs and interests. Please direct your desire to participate to the local District Ranger.
387-5	**Comment:** *A major shortage of riding opportunities exists in the state of Wisconsin. The TMR states "There are approximately 244,000 registered ATV's in Wisconsin, which is four times the number registered since 1993 (NHAL 2008). Approximately 23% of the population (959,400 people) use ATV's and 18% of the population participates in operating a vehicle off-road (SCORP, 2004)." Those are some very large numbers. On top of the ATV registration number, exists an unknown number of off-road motorcycles. There are now more registered ATV's in Wisconsin than there are snowmobiles and snowmobiles have access to approximately 20,000 miles in the state. A Wisconsin DNR report in 2004 estimates 5,555 miles of roads or trails available for ATV riding (SCORP) in Wisconsin. I am not sure exactly what those 5,555 miles are comprised of but I would think a lot of it is routes, or mostly maintained gravel roads that are open to regular vehicle traffic. The Recreation Report section of the TMR notes "ATV's are permitted at the Richard I Bong Recreation Area, two state forests and seven state trails (DNR Board meeting, 2006)." Other places may exist but that report only indicates ten places to ride the 244,000 plus OHV's in the state. It would be great if another four or five networks or loops of OHV trail were developed with in the CNNF, the 100 miles of potential new trails listed in the Forest Plan is not enough. I hope my comments on the TMR have not strayed too far from constructive feed back on specific*

	roads to an opportunity to ask for more ridding opportunities but I feel the two are intertwined since Alternative 2 and 3 are cutting the number of road miles by 2,500. I do sincerely appreciate your time in reviewing our comments on this truly monumental project. **Response:** Thank you for taking the time to share your thoughts and concerns. We will continue to develop ATV trails and routes in accordance with our Forest Plan.
388-1	**Comment:** *I am 100% for closing all of the 2,703 miles of the former logging roads and illegally created user roads. There are many, many of these illegal roads around Clam Lake, which have been brought to the attention of the USFS by concerned people who are very interested in protecting the environment. Little if anything has been done to the perpetrators. It is a clear case of resource destruction, yet no action is taken by the USFS. The Forest Service has even considered leaving these illegal roads open. Never mind the fact that federal law was broken; the perpetrators were not apprehended, nor cited nor did they go before a federal judge.* **Response:** The Forest Service appreciates all of the information it receives from local citizens regarding illegal use of roads and trails. These areas are patrolled by law enforcement officers. Unfortunately, perpetrators are difficult to catch and cite. This project provides a process for allowing the public to help determine the future road system for the Forest. If a road is left open as a result of this process the road is no longer “illegal”. If the decision is to not allow motorized access on a particular road, then it would illegal to operate a motorized vehicle on that road. The motor use vehicle map will display all legal motorized use. Most of the current resource damage found on forest roads occurs on the very low standard non-system roads. Many of these roads will be unavailable to motorized use by this decision.
388-2	**Comment:** *The Forest Service has chosen to ignore the resource damage created by the law breakers, such as ruts which cause erosion, disturbance to the wildlife, and distribution of invasive species. The destruction of wetlands which provide multiplicity of life within the forest is ongoing. Laine Stowell, Elk Biologist for the WDNR has stated that the elk would be much better off without motorized intrusion; I have a letter from him to this effect. All -terrain vehicles are very destructive motorized machines, yet the USFS caters to them and ignores people like me. There should be no question as to the correctness of the decision to close all of the logging roads and illegal user created roads-the USFS should just do it for the sake of the flora and fauna, for nature itself (continued in comment -3).* **Response:** During this travel management analysis, roads contributing to resource damage such as excessive rutting, erosion or disturbance to sensitive species of wildlife will be unavailable to motorized use. Some roads within critical elk habitat are closed to motorized use. These roads were identified by WDNR elk biologists. The Forest Service works cooperatively with the WDNR to enhance elk habitat.
388-3	**Comment:** *There are already many, many legal roads in the national forest for the people to use. I have experienced the fact that ATV users will never have enough-they always want more. They ought to try walking and stop using their pollution producing destructive machines. The bear hunters use dirt bikes and ATVs to keep up with their bear dogs. I wonder how much resource*

	damage they create every year. They just plain do not care where they go, be it wetland or whatever. I maintain that all of the US National Forests must be restored, preserved, and protected. Closing of these roads is a good beginning. **Response:** There are opportunities for many different kinds of recreational pursuits on the National Forest. Many motorized recreationists care about the forest and are careful to stay on designated roads and trails.
389-1	**Comment:** *The Wisconsin ATV Association (WATVA) represents a diverse membership across the entire state. Currently we have 94 + local chapters and their many affiliates; we serve 146 various businesses that depend on positive ATV economics because those businesses supply their local communities with hundreds if not thousands of jobs. Our constituents also include tens of thousands of ATV family members across the state of Wisconsin who enjoys their chosen form of outdoor recreation, ATV pleasure riding. WATVA certainly supports properly managed ATV trail systems and we understand that like other types of outdoor recreational endeavors, the citizens of our state expect the United States Forest Service to manage our property wisely and fairly. Our members understand public property management plans need to be adjusted from time to time to accomplish that goal. The Wisconsin ATV Association considers the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest to be a very important motorized recreational area and is appreciative of the Forest Service's commitment to the legitimate use and access of ATV's within the Forest system. Motorized trails are also used to gain access for all kinds of other recreation including camping, hiking, fishing, hunting and access to the forest for the disabled and aging population. The WATVA wishes to work with USFS to seek better solutions in order to maintain the status of the CNNF as being a premier ATV recreation destination. Our organization also collaborates with the other responsible motorized recreational here in Wisconsin, most recently meeting with and discussing the travel management plan with the off highway motorcycle, 4 x 4 truck, snowmobile and light utility vehicle communities. We realize each group and their members have different challenges and considerations as it applies to this plan.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments and willingness to continue to work with us.
389-2	**Comment:** *Alternative 1: We support this alternative because it provides the most motorized recreation use opportunities for both Highway Legal Vehicles and ATV's, however we would need to modify Alternative 1 by adding the additional trails and roads, most of which are in the Eastern Portion of the Forest specified in Alternative 3. We understand the need to reduce the amount of unauthorized roads due to maintenance costs, resource protection and suitability, but we want to keep the 318 miles of existing ATV trails in tact and don't want a wholesale reduction in roads for vehicles as offered in Alternatives #2 and #3. We would modify Alternative #1 by adding the provisions of alternative #3 that include the important increase of new ATV trails and roads that are added to the Eastern portion of the forest and the inclusion of the projects that appear on the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest April-June 2008 Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA). Since many of our organization members are also hunters, we agree that providing additional seasonal motorized access forest wide from September 15th to December 31st is an important aspect of Alternative 3 over Alternative 2, however we believe that as more people become aware of the new closings and opening or roads, the USFS will receive many more requests for additional road openings in future Motor Vehicle Use Maps. WATVA along with its clubs will continue to work with the USFS to identify and develop more ATV trails each year*. **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We look forward to continuing to work with you. Please see response to 181-3 for an

	explanation of why we are implementing this change and for a description of our decision.
389-3	**Comment:** *Motorized recreation: If UTV's (also referred to as LUV) are allowed to be used on Wisconsin all-terrain vehicles trails and routes with an appropriate registration program, the USFS should include UTV/LUV in the All-Terrain Vehicle (ATV) legal terminology that also includes motorcycles, for use on Forest roads and trails.* **Response:** UTVs are outside the scope of this project and are not currently being considered; however, we will be interested in the outcome of the pilot project within several counties in Wisconsin and expect there will be further dialog on this topic in the future.
389-4	**Comment***: MVUM: Our understanding is that the MVUM will not show the connecting of existing county ATV trails and routes outside of the forest or show how the township routes link within the forest. Our concern is that riders will be confused while trail riding and inadvertently ride where it is not legal. In order to avert this situation, we request that this type of preventative information be included on the MVUM. This request would also be helpful in planning a region-wide trail network that encompasses different ranger districts in NE and NW Wisconsin. The EA states how many miles of trails exist in surrounding counties but it is how those trails link up with the Forest Service trails to improve the trail network that would be more important. In networking the CNNF ATV trails across Northern Wisconsin the Forest Service participation is extremely important and will have a positive economic impact on the local communities. WATVA appreciates the assistance of the District Rangers and their willingness to work with the clubs and we hope this will continue. This will result in a better understanding of county and state trails and allow the CNNF to monitor the trail development in each district.* **Response:** We agree that having a "one-stop-shopping" point of information that provided users a map of motorized recreation opportunities available across all land jurisdictions would be a great benefit to the public. However, the Forest Service does not have the data available on the available motorized recreation opportunities across all jurisdictions nor does it have the resources to collect and maintain such information. We are willing to continue to cooperate with motorized use organizations and other governmental agencies to support motorized recreation in northern Wisconsin in accordance with our Forest Plan and other requirements.
390-1	**Comment:** *I propose "No Change" alternative for the Nicolet National Forest*. **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Others expressed similar comments; please see response to comment 181-3.
391-1	**Comment:** *No change, Alternative 1.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Others expressed similar comments; please see response to comment 181-3.
392-1	**Comment:** *First of all I would like to vote for option number one, NO CHANGE. I do not want to see roads in the Nicolet closed at all whatsoever unless there is a compelling need. It is public land, and the public should be able to recreate there. We have enough wilderness locked up.*

	Response: Thank you for sharing your thoughts. We are striving to strike a balance between motorized and non-motorized access needs. Hopefully as we continue this process you will be assured this balance is met. Please see response to comment 181-3.
392-2	**Comment:** *The proposal to lock up 60% of the roads in the forest is absurd. Those roads serve as access for fire suppression, logging, and recreation. For most people the roads are their window to the forest.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comments 184-1 and 340-3.
392-3	**Comment:** *Locking up all of those roads is also discriminatory. The less fit and less able are the out of the forest. A lot of people can't haul gear 2+ miles into the forest to places that were historically accessible. I am visualizing a lot of old men locked out of hunting camps and fishing spots that they have populated for 50+ years.* **Response:** Thank you for your concerns. In our decision we added approximately 205 additional miles of roads to our travel system, which equates to a 49% reduction of the miles of roads under sole Forest Service jurisdiction. These roads are only part the total miles of roads accessing the Forest. The towns, counties, and the State have jurisdiction over approximately half of the roads accessing the Forest. The 49% of miles of sole Forest Service jurisdiction roads equates to 25% of total miles of roads on the Forest. There will be a total of approximately 6,800 miles of roads under all jurisdictions accessing the Forest. Most of the roads that will be unavailable for motorized use are unauthorized roads, which are not part of the current travel system. Many of these roads are only accessible by high clearance vehicles or not accessible at all. Additionally, the number of miles of ATV trails increased by 16 miles on the west side of the Forest. We encourage your participation in providing input to the MVUM as it is updated each year. The more specific the feedback, the better we can accommodate your needs and interests. Please see response to comment 260-1.
392-4	**Comment:** *I also have issue with the proposal to lock up all of those roads on a personal level. My access to my top two fishing and camping lakes would be stopped. Likewise many of my wildlife viewing tour routes would be off-limits. I am a regular and frequent forest visitor in all seasons.* **Response:** It is important for us to provide access to those special places people enjoy; please let us know what those roads areas are so that we can evaluate the specific roads for inclusion on the map. Our decision provides a process for continually accepting suggestions for additions or deletions from the map. We encourage you to stay engaged with our annual update process. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice.
392-5	**Comment:** *Living 1.5 miles from the forest boundary, I am also sensitive to the issue of fire suppression. I have seen how the forest service has locked up and mismanaged large blocks of forest until they burn catastrophically like so many of the great western forests. I don't want to be one of those homeless people on the news because of some well meaning people advocating gross mismanagement of the forest. I submit the spotted owl habitat, and the 2-5 million acres that burns every year out west. The attempts to lock up large blocks of forest and stop logging has lead to repeated environmental disasters. It is a failed and*

	proven bad policy. The attempt to lock up all of these roads is more bad policy in that direction. **Response:** Administrative access for fire suppression is unaffected by this project. Please see response to comment 340-3.
392-6	**Comment:** *Here is the bottom line. The forest is public land. If the public can't use it, it should revert to county forest or be sold. Do not block road access. Option A, no change please.* **Response:** Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the Forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the National Forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6, 800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered "unauthorized roads"–roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the National Forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people's need for that access. Also see response to comment 241-1.
393-1	**Comment:** *Hello, I visit the area often and would like to recommend Alternative number 2 for the Forest road use project.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your thoughts. Others expressed similar comments; please see response to comment 185-1.
394-1	**Comment:** *First of all I would like to vote for option number one, NO CHANGE. I do not want to see roads in the Nicolet closed at all whatsoever unless there is a compelling need. It is public land, and the public should be able to recreate there. We have enough wilderness locked up. The proposal to lock up 60% of the roads in the forest is absurd. Those roads serve as access for fire suppression, logging, and recreation. For most people the roads are their window to the forest. Locking up all of those roads is also discriminatory. The less fit and less able are the first ones locked out of the forest. A lot of people can't haul gear 2+ miles into the forest to places that were historically accessible. I am visualizing a lot of old men locked out of hunting camps and fishing spots that they have populated for 50+ years. I also have issue with the proposal to lock up all of those roads on a personal level. My access to my top two fishing and camping lakes would be stopped. Likewise many of my wildlife viewing tour routes would be off-limits. I am a regular and frequent forest visitor in all seasons. Living 1.5 miles from the forest boundary, I am also sensitive to the issue of fire suppression. I have seen how the forest service has locked up and mismanaged large blocks of forest until they burn catastrophically like so many of the great western forests. I don't want to be one of those homeless people on the news because of some well meaning people advocating gross mismanagement of the forest. I submit the spotted owl habitat, and the 2-5 million acres that burns every year out west. The attempts to lock up large blocks of forest and stop logging has lead to repeated environmental disasters. It is a proven failed/bad policy. The attempt to lock up all of these roads is more bad policy in that direction. Here is the bottom line (continued in comment - 2)*. **Response:** Thank you for your letter. Please see response to comments 392-1, 392-2, 392-3, 392-4 and 392-5..
394-2	**Comment:** *(Continued from comment -1) The forest is public land. If the public can't use it, it should revert to county forest or be sold. Do not block road access. Option A, no change please.*

	Response: Please see response to comment 392-6.
395-1	**Comment:** *Enough is enough! I say No regarding the proposal to close more roads in the above mentioned subject matter.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Others submitted similar comments; please see response to 181-3.
396-1	**Comment:** *Please do not close the roads in the Nicolet forest. Many elderly people use those roads because they are unable to hike into the forest as a way to enjoy it. I believe this would be a bad decision. I vote for option number 1, No Change. Thank you.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. Please see response to comment 181-3.
397-1	**Comment:** *Please include my voice among those in support of the proposed road closures in the Chequamegon-Nicolet Forest. I am, as you are, well aware the common arguments regarding trail maintenance costs, fuel consumption, pollution, and health concerns because of physical inactive associated within motorized transportation. The idea of speeding, noisy, motorized vehicle traveling through our last vestiges of 'wilderness' in Wisconsin seems incongruous. I believe there are some areas, particularly in our National Forests, where the solitude and wilderness integrity of our remaining forests should be maintained and appreciated for those very qualities. I very much appreciate your efforts regarding the review, and sincerely hope trail closure to motorized vehicles becomes a reality.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your thoughts. Others expressed similar comments; please see response to 185-1.
398-1	**Comment:** *I prefer Alternative 3 of your management plans. However, you should leave FR 449 open to ATVs. That road is needed as a connector between the other roads in that area. Without 449, all the other roads become dead-ends. I believe riders will cheat in that situation. Also, FR 420 should also be open to ATV travel. It is your plan to allow trucks and jeeps on it, ATVs will not hurt it any more than trucks.* **Response:** FR 449 (except portion SW of 241) designated use was reviewed and changed to hlv, atv in the selected alternative; This road was designated as open in NW Sands proposed action. Bayfield County and Ashland County board both noted that they would like this road open for an ATV route and berry picking. FR 420 was also changed to hlv, atv with the exception of a segment north from road 50842 through the Lakehead Pump station. This designation is to provide an ATV loop in an area that is currently highly used as an ATV route
398-2	**Comment:** *As a matter of fact, I believe that all roads open to automobiles should be open to ATVs. It has/had been that way for years and the ATVs do no more damage than 4 X 4 trucks. I live here and ride here and I've seen the results of ATV riding. Most of these roads see ATV traffic only occasionally and no harm is done. Your consideration of this will be appreciated.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your observations. We are striving to strike a balance for motorized uses.
399-1	**Comment:** *I am writing to you to express my support for the proposed road closures in the Chequamegon-Nicolet Forest. In addition to the obvious (liability, impact, quality of nature experience) the motorized experience within forest boundaries is a no*

	win for all concerned. The cost of maintenance and liability alone is reason enough, but combined with the actual trail impact on habitat as well as motorized introduction of invasive weeds and biota is clearly obvious to all those with ability to reason. Leave the motorized out of the public lands, and help the health and understanding of the nature experience in a way that will protect this dwindling resource for the future of our children. Thank you for listening to my comments. I applaud this type of legislation because it is the right way to preserve what little remains of public semi-wilderness areas. **Response:** Thank you for sharing your opinions. Others expressed similar opinions. Please response to comment 185-1.
400-1	**Comment:** *I would like to voice my opinion as "No Change" Alternative one for this Project. I use many forest roads in the area and would like to see them maintained.* **Response:** Many people submitted a similar comment. Please see the response to comment 181-3.
401-1	**Comment***: As a frequent user of forest roads in Nicolet national forest, I request no change in present road use policy. I am 61 years old and walk with a cane in the woods. If the roads are closed off, I will not be able to pick berries or watch birds. I have used the forest roads my entire life and would be very saddened to loose this use now that I really need them.* **Response:** We appreciate your desire to continue to experience the Forest. We encourage people of all abilities to use the Forest. Please see response to comment 260-1. Please also note that this decision will continue to provide plenty of access that a majority of the people use. The roads that will be unavailable to motorized use are those that may normally require a 4-wheel drive vehicle to access.
402-1	**Comment:** *Please include my voice among those in support of the proposed road closures in the Chequamegon-Nicolet Forest. I am, as you are, well aware the common arguments regarding trail maintenance costs, fuel consumption, pollution, and health concerns because of physical inactive associated within motorized transportation. The idea of speeding, noisy, motorized vehicle traveling through our last vestiges of 'wilderness' in Wisconsin seems incongruous. I believe there are some areas, particularly in our National Forests, where the solitude and wilderness integrity of our remaining forests should be maintained and appreciated for those very qualities. I very much appreciate your efforts regarding the review, and sincerely hope trail closure to motorized vehicles becomes a reality.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment in support of our proposal. Many others also expressed the same support. We believe our decision provides for a balance between motorized and non-motorized use.
403-1	**Comment:** *We need FR184G to remain open and not be closed as it appears on the Alternative 2 proposal map. Our club, myself and many of my friends and neighbors use FR183 to FR184 and then 184G to access paper mill property to ATV on. Many of our friends from Mellen access the same property from the north and exit 184G to ride to Cayuga, Glidden and Clam Lake. We feel FS may be unaware of the importance of 184G to so many If there are issues we need to find out so they can be addressed.* **Response:** In the original roads proposal, district personnel recommended FR 184G be closed due to concerns related to

	wildlife and old growth. In your response you stated that several people including yourself used this road as part of a connector route system. Other people also commented that this was the case and requested that the road remain available to motorized use. As a result of this feedback, district personnel decided to reexamine their original recommendation. Upon field reconnaissance of the road the district found an illegal user developed ATV trail connecting the end of FR 184G to private property to the north. This user developed trail was located on Forest Service land in a designated old growth area and crossed an intermittent drainage in several locations. In an effort to control the illegal use and damage, the district maintains its recommendation that the road not be open to motorized use. The district is willing to work with you in finding a more suitable route through this area. Please contact us the Great Divide Ranger District.
404-1	**Comment:** *Disagree with closing any roads. This is due to the environmental side, the timber side, the fuels/fire side, and the search and rescue side. Lots of money has been spent by taxpayers on these roads and they should be kept open. It is a huge value to the USFS to have these roads.* **Response:** Thank you for your concerns about protecting and harvesting the Forest. It is important to note our decision does not affect access for administrative purposes. It will not affect our ability to continue to manage the Forest, including access for timber harvest and fire suppression. Our decision and the MVUM are strictly focused on public wheeled motorized vehicle use.
405-1	**Comment:** *I am deeply concerned about closing all these roads and trails off in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest in the Township of Drummond. I see you even have a trail marked to be closed off that is on my property. (I have owned 120 acres in the Township of Drummond for 34 years.) If closing roads and trails are a plan to save money, I would like to have it explained to me how you can save money when most of the trails that I am familiar with have been maintained by the people who use them, not by the forest service.* **Response:** Saving money is not the purpose for making these roads unavailable for motorized use. These roads are what we term unauthorized roads, which we have not determined are necessary for the protection, administration, and utilization of the Forest. You are correct; we do not maintain these roads. If we are showing a road on your property, that is an error. It is our intention not to show any roads on private property on the motor vehicle use map (MVUM), which we are scheduled to publish in January 2009.
405-2	**Comment***: It is really very sad and shameful to see lakes closed off that at one time were beautiful and productive but now are dead waters. The Forest Management procedures actually killed them off. That is the sinful part of it. The bodies of water I refer to are Anderson Lake and Wabigon Lake. Both lakes were great trout lakes, but they need to be stocked to survive. When the roads were open, the DNR did a good job on maintaining and stocking them.* **Response:** WDNR records indicate Anderson Lake was stocked with rainbow trout from 1972 to 1976, and then largemouth bass from 1985 to 1987. Anderson Lake is located in Rainbow Lake Wilderness and is one of the least accessible lakes in the wilderness. Given the access and wilderness setting, Anderson Lake has been managed for a naturally reproducing native fishery of largemouth bass. This provides the opportunity for a remote, walk-in fishing experience for native fish. Monitoring over

	the past several years indicates the lake has a healthy population of largemouth bass. In 2008, 29 bass were sampled in Anderson Lake and they ranged in size from 8 to 15 inches; many young-of-year bass were also observed. According to WDNR records, Wabigon Lake was stocked with northern pike in 1989, 1991, and 1992, and largemouth bass in 1999 and 2001; there are no records of trout stocking for that lake. Wabigon Lake had a full fishery survey in 1996 which indicated the lake has a good largemouth bass population along with some northern pike and panfish. A more limited sampling in 2006 found a number of bass ranging in size from 9 to 15 inches and many young-of-year bass which indicate good natural reproduction. These lakes are not dead, but are relatively healthy and naturally support a warm water fishery. These lakes have very soft water which limits their productivity and makes them susceptible to acidification. Thus, we are primarily concerned about the effects of acid and mercury deposition on these lakes. Trout are a cold water fishery, not native to these lakes and cannot reproduce in such an environment. Thus only artificial stocking will maintain the fishery. Some lakes in the area are stocked to provide a recreational trout fishing opportunity. Lakes selected for such management tend to be more accessible and less likely to support a viable native fishery. Examples in that area include Beaver, Balsam Pond, Little Star, Nymphia and Perch Lakes. Beaver is located within Rainbow Lake Wilderness, but is a short distance from the Delta-Drummond Road.
405-3	**Comment:** *The last time I went in to Anderson Lake, the beaver had taken over. What was once a beautiful, picturesque lake with pines on the south and east side and birch on the north and west side was now an unbelievably sad-looking mess. The beaver had cut the birch, and it was lying in the water and all over. What a picture of mismanagement. If you feel that I am just blowing smoke, I would be very willing to take a walk with someone so they can see what I am talking about*. **Response:** We can appreciate your description of Anderson Lake. Anderson Lake lies within the congressionally designated Rainbow Lake Wilderness Area. Because it is in a Wilderness area if falls within the management guidelines set forth by the 1964 Wilderness act. Section 2(c) of the act states that "A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of underdeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable…" Using this definition of "wilderness" allows areas that fall within congressionally designated areas, such as Anderson Lake, to remain in their natural state. While this definition can be difficult to work with at times (wildland fire, insect and disease outbreaks), it has allowed the area to act as a control subject for management activities outside of the congressionally designated areas. If you were to look at all land management as an experiment, one of the few ways to understand the processes of the experiment would be to monitor the control. By allowing beaver dam building and other possibly destructive natural activities to occur within the area, we are allowing the area to retain its natural processes while still monitoring the area for effects of such a beaver pond. We can then take that information and use it in further management decisions. By allowing native animals to continue natural processes, whether destructive or beneficial, we insure the opportunity for future generations to witness these processes and

	their effect on the land is ensured.
405-4	**Comment:** *The Balsam Pond is another body of water that was great trout waters. They were capable of reproduction, but it is nearly impossible to get to them. I haven't tried to get back to them for some time, but within a year or two after they were closed off, I tried to get back to them and found the trail so plugged up with downed timber that I could not find the trail and finally had to give up. Again, if this was open to drive into, the people that used the trail would have kept it open. Now you are going to close Big Brook Lake Trail off, another trail that is maintained by the public, not the forest service. Well, I have been told that I can carry a canoe in on the trail, but within one year that trail will be blocked off with downed trees. It is over a mile into the lake, and at the age of 70, I see it becoming another dead lake. What a sin! Over the last 25 years, I have taken many young people into it, nephews and grandchildren, among others, that did not have fathers to take them fishing. It brings tears to my eyes just thinking about it.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. Both Balsam Pond and Big Brook Lake are in non-motorized areas. These non-motorized areas were designated as such well before this project. These lakes will remain accessible only by non-motorized means.
405-5	**Comment:** *I started fishing this area, where all these waters are, in 1953. The way I see it, is that if you are going to keep closing the National Forest off, then just close it all off and get rid of all the forest employees, which you won't need. Just think of the money that could be saved. From an early age on, I was taught that man was placed on earth to manage it. If this is managing, I must have missed the boat somewhere.* **Response:** We appreciate your desire to continue to fish these waters. There is and will continue to be a balance between little to no management and intensive management of certain areas of the National Forest. The Forest Plan provides the road map for how we will manage the Forest. We need to make a determination on how and where we will manage the unauthorized roads on the Forest. We realize many of them have been used by people for several years to access lakes and streams. It is important for people to continue to have access to streams and lakes to fish, etc.
407-1	**Comment:** *We need to keep FR184G open for business and recreation.* **Response:** Motorized connector trails and routes are an important aspect of motorized recreational opportunities. The district has been working with local ATV groups and town supervisors to identify and plan for connector ATV trails. FR 184G is not suitable for this type of opportunity. More suitable locations need to be identified for future development.
408-1	**Comment:** *I think there is already enough forest roads closed to public use. I looked at the Alternative maps. I am for alternative 1.* **Response:** Many people submitted a similar comment. Please see the response to comment 181-3.
409-1	**Comment:** *I am writing to strongly object to any road closures in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest. I have physical*

	issues that limit my mobility, and have a US Forest Service handicap permit. I very much enjoy picking berries and hunting in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest, and my ability to continue these activities would be greatly reduced, if not eliminated, by the proposed closures. **Response:** We welcome people with all abilities to the Forest and we appreciate your desire to continue using the Forest. Many people expressed similar concerns. Please see response to comment 180-1. Please also note that we will continue to issue disabled ATV permits on the east side of the Forest until an expanded network of ATV routes/trails is in place.
410-1	**Comment***: As a manager of a local business in Clam Lake, WI, I find it very important for you to have FR184G to remain open. This is a very important part of trade for our business by users of this road.* **Response:** The district has been working with representatives from the Clam Lake ATV Club to identify important connector trail systems within the Clam Lake area. We understand this is an important economic component of tourism in this area.
411-1	**Comment***: Mike had called on August 4th to express his concern over the idea of reduced motorized access to the National Forest. Those comments are on a separate comment form. Today he provided a specific road that he would like to see open under TMR. It is FR 303.* **Response:** Thank you for calling back with a specific comment. FR 303 is a closed, gated road; it has been closed for some time and will remain closed. Roads closed under previous decisions were not re-evaluated because they were already analyzed under previous analysis.
412-1	**Comment:** *I would like to have 184G stay open.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Others commented on 184G as well. Please see responses 403-1, 407-1, and 410-1.
413-1	**Comment:** *I am writing this to express my support for the proposed road closures in the Chequamegon-Nicolet Forest. There already are more than enough opportunities for those who use motorized vehicles in our National Forest. I urge you not to give in to those who want to drive everywhere. There is a need for areas where these vehicles are not allowed, where hikers, bikers, and skiers can enjoy nature without the pollution and noise and trail destruction that vehicles bring, whether intended or not. Please protect our Forest for those of us who want to experience nature in peace and quiet*. **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Many others also expressed the same support. We believe our decision provides for a balance between motorized and non-motorized use. Our decision also provides a responsible methodology for adding roads to our travel system.
414-1	**Comment***: I am sending this e-mail in regard to the Proposed Travel Management Plan for the Nicolet-Chequamegon National Forest. I do not believe that this plan is in the best interest of the people and certainly not the resource. Being involved in the paper industry and also having property in Managed Forest Land I can't understand why you would want to close a road that would give you access for logging, fire protection and recreation for that matter. Some people would say that if we should have a*

	fire it would not require a significant amount of work or time to remove a berm on one of these roads to gain access, however, as you know it takes only a short amount of time (5 years) for these roads to become impassable to vehicular travel such as fire trucks. Certainly there may be a short term savings in not having to keep the roads passable but the long term effect certainly would outweigh that savings. As I am sure you are aware the Wisconsin Managed Forest Law recommends that all land owners maintain logging roads within their property because it is more cost effective in the long run due to the high cost of building roads in the future. Wouldn't that be the case here as well? **Response:** This decision does not affect access for administrative purposes such as timber harvest and fire suppression. These roads will not be physically closed without a broad comprehensive analysis to determine what roads are needed for Forest management.
414-2	**Comment:** *One of the biggest deterrents to logging timber or pulp for that matter is the high cost of building roads to access the resource. With that in mind how can we say that there is a negligible impact? As I am sure you are aware, when you live in that area there are certainly not a lot of jobs to come by and if you are not in the timber producing business I suspect there are less than half that. Last but not least, as a taxpayer, after we have spent the money to build a road I can't see the advantage of closing it only to rebuild it at a later date. Quite frankly I think this is ridiculous. Certainly we can find better ways to spend our future tax dollars.* **Response:** This decision will not close roads needed for administrative purposes, including roads for timber management. The roads in question are not roads that were constructed for the purposes of long-term management. They may have been utilized for timber extraction in the past, but may or may not be needed for Forest management in the future. We will make a site-specific assessment of each of these roads to determine what if any are need for long-term management. You will have the opportunity to comment on any proposals to eliminate these roads for future use.
415-1	**Comment:** *I would like to see a "No change" policy in effect for the Nicolet National Forest. The national forest is public land and as a tax paying citizen of Wisconsin. I should have the right to use this land. I am a hunter, snowmobiler and ATVer. Please do not block us out of the beautiful north woods of Wisconsin.* **Response:** We can assure you that as Forest managers, we take our Agency's mission very seriously, especially when it pertains to sustaining the health, diversity, and productivity of this Forest to meet the needs of present and future generations. We also recognize that motor vehicle use is highly valued among many Forest users. Please also see response to comment 181-3.
416-1	**Comment***: I was surprised at the article in the Wisconsin Outdoor News, July 25, 2008 on the proposed road closures in the eastern Chequamegon-Nicolet Forest and what really surprised me were the three major reasons given. I submit the following for your consideration: 1. Areas where there are wolf packs. Motorized vehicles don't impact wolves anymore than it does coyotes on the recreation trails here in Oregon. They slink away at the sound of the approaching vehicle. If they are on a kill they simply return to it after the vehicles pass. I have pictures. 2. Elk calving areas. We have Roosevelt elk that we occasionally see as soon*

	as we leave our home in the Tillamook Forest in the Coast Mountain Range. They will either stop and watch us pass or slowly move off. Wisconsin calving areas in May, I would suspect, have no negative impact from recreational riders. If a cow was disturbed she would simply move a short distance to another area nearby. The only issue with calving areas in Wisconsin is that the wolf packs will help with the birthing; one bite at a time. ATV's, snowmobiles, motorcycles, etc. are not an issue because the forest animals grow up with noises in the forest and adapt. **Response:** Wolves were not the reason for roads being unavailable for motorized use. While one of the outcomes of this project would be a reduction in the number of miles of open roads within wolf pack territories, it is not one of the purposes of this project. Wildlife was used as one of the resource risks in the roads analysis along with public values. Wolves were a sub-category in wildlife and were always assessed low risk. Please see the wildlife report for more detailed information regarding elk and wolves.
416-2	**Comment:** *Native invasive species. Have you ever tried to get rid of an invasive species? Any invasive species?* **Response:** Yes, we have. We began a program of controlling non-native invasive plants in 1997. The amount of success varies. There are areas where we have eradicated invasive plants while in other areas, depending on the species, eliminating them is not feasible and we try to prevent new infestations. Please see the NNIS Specialist Report, which is a supporting document to this project's EA or see the CNNF website for more NNIS information: http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/cnnf/natres/nnis/index.html
416-3	**Comment:** *With all due respect what you should not do is lessen the areas for recreational riders and the reason is simple. By closing half the trails the other half is going to get all that additional pressure and deterioration of the trails is twice as fast. I encourage you to keep the trails open. All of them.* **Response:** We believe our decision provides a balance between motorized and non motorized uses. Please see response to comment 184-1 for a discussion of the total roads accessing the Forest and the various jurisdictions.
417-1	**Comment:** *Please consider reopening the forest trail directly north of the old CCC camp (South Fork) and located on the north side of Forest Road 144 (on Shady Knoll Road). This trail is now gated. The trail runs .5 miles from FR 144 directly to the existing trail 19/111 on snowmobile map. Trail portion borders between and parallel to forest and private held land. It is a simple sand trail; therefore there would be no environmental impact for wet land intrusion. No impact on residence or other people. Opening this trail would allow new Byhre Lake residents to access existing trail system without having to travel on asphalt FR144 with dangerous curves, thereby reducing possibility of an ATV/car collision. Note trail is not numbered and does not show on any current maps.* **Response:** We appreciate your interest in opening a currently closed road. Roads that were already closed based on previous site-specific decisions were not further considered and will remain closed. Currently FR 144 is also closed to ATV traffic in the vicinity of Byhre Lake. Opening the road identified by the commenter would require illegal use of FR 144 to access the connector road from Byhre Lake development.

418-1	**Comment:** *By closing roads in the National Forests you'll be reducing or eliminating many recreational uses such as hunting, trapping, fishing, bird watching, photography, etc. It will be much more difficult to get to many of the inner most areas ands the impact will have severe consequences. If a deer hunter is able to get to the inner most areas, if he shoots a deer or bear, it will be next to impossible to remove the animal. If the deer number are not controlled, they will browse the understory and you are more aware than I of the damage deer do to a forest. Do you really want to allow that to happen to our National Forests? Trappers will not be able to get to these same inner most areas and the beaver will be uncontrolled causing increased damage to the forests. People that bird watch and do photography will not get to these same areas and will miss out on viewing species and great views. Older citizens that enjoy being in the outdoors will be limited to the areas they will be hiking in. They may not be fit enough to walk many miles to get to the intended are they really wanted to hike in. The tax paying citizens of this great state and country should be allowed to travel these roads to enjoy all recreational opportunities. I ask that you reconsider closing these roads; the citizens of Wisconsin want them to remain open for our use and enjoyment.* **Response:** On the contrary, we believe our decision still provides plenty of access to the Forest for the hunting activities you describe. It also provides for options for expanding the network responsibly. We will continue to listen to your specific suggestions to designate specific roads and trails for motor vehicle use, and will continue to incorporate your suggestions in the future as we prepare subsequent MVUMs. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of this process. Continued management of the deer herd is important to maintain the health of the Forest as well as support an important part of our heritage. The selected alternative provides for additional fall access to accommodate the fall hunting seasons. Please also see response to comment 184-1 for a discussion of the total roads accessing the Forest and the various jurisdictions.
419-1	**Comment:** *Regarding the TMR he finds that the decision is a good one as far as what we decided to open and keep closed. He is not a bit ATV fan. He owns property within the PF landbase.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Many others also expressed the same support. We believe our decision provides for a balance between motorized and non-motorized use. Our decision also provides a responsible methodology for adding roads to our travel system.
420-1	**Comment:** *Road in question: Starts on County or State W510271 is eliminated in Alt. 2 and 3. Closes off a large area for deer hunting. Feels this road should be maintained opened for hunting (deer) season to thin population; would only like this to be open to highway legal vehicles only. Would close off access to private cabin on Traverses Lake.* **Response:** W510271 begins on private property and ends on Bayfield County Forest land. The Forest Service has no jurisdictional right-of-way, easement, or right to designate access on other ownership.
420-2	**Comment:** Alternative 2 and 3 are too restrictive. It will drive hunters away to other communities. It will cause impacts to the local economies. **Response:** Thank you for your concerns. Others felt the same; please see response to comment 181-3. Regarding your

	economic issue please see response to comment 332-3.
421-1	**Comment:** *I would like to see 420, 419A, 418 left open for ATV use and hunting purposes.* **Response:** Thank you for providing road-specific comments. We appreciate knowing what's important to you. We have evaluated the roads you suggested and provide the following information: FR 420 was changed to HLV, ATV with the exception of a segment north from Road 50842 through the Lakehead Pump station private property. FR419A and FR418 are open to HLV and ATV in the selected alternative.
422-1	**Comment:** *Road 420: Keep open for ATV use - hunting, recreation, berry picking. Road 420 makes an excellent ATV route as a short cut from 419 to 241. As a highway legal road only, it should be mad wide for two vehicles - will this road be graded if highway legal?* **Response:** Thank you for bringing this road forward and sharing how you use this road. We have evaluated this road and provide the following as to how this road will be designated: FR 420 was changed in the selected alternative to HLV, ATV with the exception of a segment north from road 50842 through the Lakehead Pump station private property. Grading will not take place on FR420 until administrative access is needed, and will then be funded through the project that requires access (typically timber).
423-1	**Comment:** *I use trail #449 (Road No.) all the time for hunting and recreation.* **Response:** FR 449 designated use was reviewed and changed to HLV, ATV in the selected alternative.
423-2	**Comment:** *Every year you close just a little more of the forest. My tax dollars help take care of it. I would like to continue to enjoy it. I realize all of the national forest can not be open but you have plenty of it closed to the public already.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concerns about losing access to your National Forest. We believe this decision provides a balance of motorized and non-motorized access. However, if there are specific roads you are concerned about please let us know. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of this process.
424-1	**Comment:** *I would like to see the following Forest Roads stay open or open for ATVs, also to allow access to hunting areas for both rifle and bow seasons: 419A, 420, 420A, 441A, 50842.* **Response:** We appreciate your specific comments for our consideration. We offer the following in response: FR419A is open to HLV and ATV in the selected alternative. FR 420 was changed in the selected alternative to HLV, ATV with the exception of a segment north from Road 50842 through the Lakehead Pump station private property. Although FR 420A is shown as a through road connecting FR420 and FR241, the Forest Service does not have legal authority to cross the private parcel in Section 8. For this reason and due to concerns expressed by the private landowner, HLV only has been designated for those portions of the road located on National Forest Land. No motorized designation will be made for the private portion of the road. The Forest Service has no FR 441A in its inventory, therefore it can not be addressed. Road 50842 is designated for HLV, September 1

	through December 31 in the selected alternative.
425-1	**Comment:** *420 should be open to ATV and not just highway legal.* **Response:** There seems to be a lot interest in this road. FR 420 was changed in the selected alternative to HLV, ATV with the exception of a segment north from Road 50842 through the Lakehead Pump station private property.
426-1	**Comment:** *Forest Road 420 should be left open - it is a great connecting link from Sawdust Lake Rd. 241 to Forest Road 419. It is a very useable road to go from the east - west to continue on 241 or on to 419 north or south. Please keep this open for ATVs. Also 418 roads need to be left open for ATVs.* **Response:** FR 420 was changed in the selected alternative to HLV, ATV with the exception of a segment north from Road 50842 through the Lakehead Pump station private property. FR418 is open to HLV and ATV in the selected alternative.
427-1	**Comment:** *I am totally against closing any more roads in the Nicolet. It seems like all you people ever do is to study more areas to close down access to. You're making it harder and harder to use the forest for your stated multipurpose use as the population ages. Why don't you set up ore timber cuts in the Deerskin area? This would create a few more roads so they area could be accessed more. It also would remove a lot of the timber that is now rotting and dying of old age. Do some clear cutting and manage for aspen growth. There is more wildlife that benefits from aspen than either jack pine or red pine. You can't manage the forest for just wolf. I was born and raised in this area and have seen the Nicolet deteriorate to the point where it doesn't sustain wildlife, jobs, or timber production. This is a far cry from the way this forest was managed twenty or thirty years ago. I hope you'll take my comments seriously but I fear nothing much is going to change. The Forest Service seems to have adopted a hands off approach so as not to anger the yuppies and tree huggers.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concerns. We continue to propose projects to implement the goals in the Forest Plan. These include active management of the Forest to provide habitat for many wildlife species. It is also a goal to provide Forest products for the local communities. At times there is not agreement on how we should manage the Forest. Citizens have a right to comment on and appeal our decisions we make to manage the Forest. Your opinions count.
428-1	**Comment:** *I find the Alt. 2 map I received very confusing. Trails shown presently legal are illegal in this map.* **Response:** We apologize if our maps are confusing. We encourage you to visit your local District office so the exact trails and roads can be reviewed.
428-2	**Comment:** *Is there a list of "miles of trails legal for ATVs that are dead in roads" of short length? People don't use trails that are short dead enders very much. To include these in total miles is ridiculous. I would like to see more connector trails. As in FR204, where no people live on it, why can't we ride it?* **Response:** We recognize ATV use as a legitimate use of National Forest System lands under direction mandated b the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960**.** To some Forest users, dead end roads provide valuable access for hunting, dispersed

	camping, firewood gathering and bough gathering. As land managers we need to balance the needs of all people and their desired use of the Forest. FR204 is a town road. The town designates motorized use on this road. Please see response to letter 181-3 for an explanation of why this project is necessary.
428-3	**Comment:** *Also, would you address side by side ATVs that are 52" or less wide and weigh less than 1000#. I would like to see them in the same group as an ATV ("between the legs").* **Response:** The Forest's definition of an ATV mirrors the State's definition and UTVs do not fall within the state's definition of an ATV. UTVs are not allowed on State roads or trails at this time other than on a trial basis in a few northern counties. The Forest will monitor the State's handling of UTVs in the future and we may consider allowing UTVs at that time.
428-4	**Comment:** *Also, why not license ATVs as they do in Montana, like a motorcycle? A lot of revenue for your pocket. Please consider.* **Response:** Currently the State of Wisconsin requires that all ATVs are registered (similar to licensing in other states). The funds collected by registration are placed into a fund overseen by Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). This fund is available for use by the Forest Service and other government entities such as local counties and towns through a grant application process. Approximately $450.00 per mile is available for general motorized trail maintenance. Trail construction and rehabilitation funds are also available on an "as needed" basis. By allowing the WDNR to continue the registering of ATVs we allow all management entities to provide for safe trails across the State, not just on the Chequamegon-Nicolet NF.
429-1	**Comment:** *I am a native of Cable, WI and now live in Minneapolis but maintain a cabin on Lake Namakagon near our original family home. I grew up using these trails and tote roads to hunt and utilize the forest. Many of these roads lead to, and are the only access to remote lakes which I grew up fishing and is part of the appeal of the area to me. Many of these lakes have already been effectively been put off limits by vast areas already closed to motorized vehicles. This resource, part of the public domain, enjoyed for generations is now unavailable and unreachable by most (if a fish jumps in Patsy Lake and no one see it, or catches it, did it really jump?). My sons will not have the ability to experience this part of the beauty of northern Wisconsin and will be denied access to what rightfully should be a public resource. Is this not what of what my already high taxes pay for, and now this will be, and already has been taken away? To me this is an outrage and has already gone too far. Is it the intent of the Forest Service to tailor the area we love so that only Mountain Bikers and Cross Country Skiers can access the country? This is clearly discriminates against hunters and fishermen, even the elderly or handicapped. After all, it was hunting and fishing that was ands is the backbone of the area. For decades these areas have been used and enjoyed by thousands with no detrimental effects to anything. The environment is rich, and game thrives like never before. An occasional pickup truck accessing a logging road does no damage to anything. Lo, it helps, as these sportsmen who love the area and their sport, invest untold millions for the welfare of game animals. What has some spandex clad tourist form out of state done for deer of Ruffed Grouse?* **Response:** We appreciate your long time use of the Forest and recognize your desire to continue to use this very special place in northern Wisconsin. We agree that remote lakes is one of the characteristics of the Forest that draws people here. Please let

	us know which lakes you access and we will evaluate the roads accessing those lakes in our future updates to the MVUM. Please see response to comment 181-3 for a discussion on why we are implementing this project and the rationale for our decision.
429-2	**Comment:** *And the law of unintended consequences will most likely take effect. More people will be pushed to compete for access to smaller areas. Hunter will have less access which will lead to conflict among themselves, and with others seeking to travel and recreate in the same areas. Private property owners will face increased trespassing by those seeking an area to do whatever they are trying to do (example: Bear Dog hunters with less ability to track there animals will trespass even more willfully), there will probably be open disobedience, perhaps resentment will inspire vandalism, and most of all the area at all (maybe that is the real intent of this?). And why? This is a big area and it has been fine the way it is forever. Why close it? Wolves? Again the law of unintended consequences could take affect; this could breed resentment by humans being crowded out by wolves, and harassment or worse could result. As a native, I can tell you that wolves are already strongly disliked by the locals and this will only make it worse. The wolf packs are growing have plenty of room and food as it is - this rings hallow as a justification.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and we understand your concern that many hunters could be using the same areas due to the motorized access available to them. We have found no evidence that hunters will only hunt where motorized access is allowed. We have heard from many other hunters who prefer a non-motorized experience and support our proposals. We believe our decision provides a balance between motorized and non-motorized experiences and believe there will be adequate access for everyone. We encourage you stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process. Regarding the potential for trespassing, we do not agree that our decision will cause increased trespassing. We cannot predict the future actions of Forest visitors. Regarding your comment on wolves: wolves were not the reason for any roads being unavailable for motorized use. While one of the outcomes of this project would be a reduction in the number of miles of open roads within wolf pack territories, it is not one of the purposes of this project. Wildlife was used as one of the resource risks in the roads analysis along with public values. Wolves were a sub-category in wildlife and were always assessed low risk. Please see the wildlife report for more detailed information regarding elk and wolves.
429-3	**Comment:** *How about enforcement? How many more taxes and fees must be raised, to be paid by fewer and fewer, to hire more and more government agents and bureaucrats to tell us what we can't do? This is another bad example of government overreaching. Leave the current rules in place.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 181-3 for a discussion on why we are implementing the Travel Management Rule and the rationale for our decision.

430-1	**Comment:** *I would support Alternative 1 for the Laona landbase and the Lakewood landbase. The reason for this is twofold. The road system we have in place was put in place to promote timber harvest and for fire prevention. Without this road system neither is possible. We need this road system to promote timber harvesting. I would like further studies done on the economic ramifications on the lack of timber sales in these areas and the forest as a whole. I would also like to see a study on the fuel loads in portions of the forest that would become inaccessible. The forest came into being with the Clark McNary act for the purpose of providing timber production for the stability of the local economy, Fire prevention and tourism. I can see current management practices do not allow for timber production suitable levels, and if this goes through the fire prevention with also be less likely. Thank you in advance for your consideration in this matter.* **Response:** Thank you for your concerns about protecting and harvesting the Forest. It is important to note our decision does not affect access for administrative purposes. It will not affect our ability to continue to manage the Forest, including access for timber harvest and fire suppression. Our decision and the MVUM are strictly focused on public wheeled motorized vehicle use. It is true that the amount of timber harvesting on the Forest has declined over time. Recent appeals and litigation of project decisions has reduced the amount of timber available to be sold. We continue to work to maintain or increase the timber sale program to benefit local economies. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
431-1	**Comment:** *I strongly support your proposal to protect our northern forests and their ecosystems by closing 55% of the forest to motorized traffic. We need to balance the needs of individuals who enjoy both motorized and /or silent recreation. Even more we need to preserve the qualities we seek in a forest for future generations to enjoy. Preserving that quality means limiting motorized access to the forests. I support the second alternative for forest roads presented to the public in October, 2007. The second alternative has the least mileage open to traffic in the forests while maintaining access for hunting, bough & firewood gathering, recreation, and to private holdings. Most of the roads to be closed are small and virtually inaccessible, or the areas are already connected by state, county, and city roads. Forest roads and motorized traffic bring with them a number of negative consequences: spread of invasive species, damage to plant life and animal habitat, breaking up of continuous tracts that are necessary to the survival of some species, damage to wetlands and other environmentally sensitive areas, and the loss of the peace and quiet that many of us seek when we spend time in our forests. A healthy forest can support only so many roads. Please hold firm to your proposal to protect our northern forests by closing 55% of them to motorized traffic. The second alternative road proposal (October, 2007) is the closest to this needed protection. The other alternative proposals are not acceptable. Thank you for this opportunity for this opportunity for public input.* **Response:** Thank you for taking the time to share your perspective. Many people expressed similar support. Each of the alternatives reflects a compromise between recreational use and resource protection. We believe our decision provides for a balance of all types of access for all Forest users, both motorized and non-motorized. Please see response to comment 185-1.
432-1	**Comment:** *I am concerned that alternative 2 and 3 do not address the needs of the public rgarding forest access. I support alternative 1 which as I understand would be no change in current access. Both alternatives 2 and three severely restrict travel in the forest with any type of motorized vehicle and offer little in the way of any additional recreation opportunities. I thought the Nicolet National Forest was set up for people to enjoy nature but how can that happen with so little access. This seems to*

	hamper the disabled and elderly access places to hunt, pick berries, and just to get away. I feel we have a right to be there and able to get there without the Forest Service erecting barriers and obstacles. **Response:** Many people expressed a similar comment. Please understand that many of the roads that will be unavailable for motorized use are unauthorized or low-standard roads, which generally require a four-wheel drive to access. We believe that our decision still provides enough access for all Forest users. Please also see responses to comments 181-3 and 260-1.
432-2	**Comment:** *I also believe that closing roads will concentrate vehicle traffic on the remaining open roads. This will also concentrate the deer hunters and I question the safety of that.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 217-1 regarding motorized hunting.
432-3	**Comment:** *This will cripple the deer hunting. Bow hunters and rifle hunters need this access. The lost hunters effects the local economy and also the revenue from the hunting licenses.* **Response:** Many people expressed a similar comment. Please understand that many of the roads that will be unavailable for motorized use are unauthorized or low-standard roads, which generally require a four-wheel drive to access. We believe that our decision still provides enough access for all Forest users. Regarding the economic issue please see comment 332-3 and Appendix A to this document.
433-1	**Comment:** *One of the main reasons I camp in the Nicolet by Eagle River and Florence is the lack of ATVs. I like it the way it is in Alternative 1. The way it has been. Some townships roads are open to ATVs and that's fine for them, but that's also enough. Lots easier for them to change if they want to. Restricting access for pickups is unnecessary. I see very few problems on the Forest roads. There's always few who lack common sense. In the Eagle River Florence District I don't see that it's broke so there's no need to fix it.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 181-3.
434-1	**Comment:** *Our comment about the Travel Management Project is that all roads and trails that are not on the Ashland Co. map should be closed to all highway legal motorized vehicles and all terrain vehicles because of the damage they do to the environment and the forest. The only vehicles exempted from this are vehicles that are used for logging and National Forest owned vehicles.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. Our decision provides for a balance of motorized and non-motorized use and provides for sustainable access. Please see response to comment 185-1 for more details.
434-2	**Comment:** *The ATV registration fees don't cover the cost and maintenance of the trails so the taxpayers are picking up part of the cost of these trails so a few people can run around and destroy the environment of the forest.* **Response:** ATV registration fees do cover almost all of the cost associated with high amounts of motorized trail use. The fees

	generated have allowed us to do a great amount of work and maintenance that would otherwise be pulled out of funds for campgrounds and other user facilities. Each year funds are received from the State through ATV registration fees. These funds are used solely to provide a safe and enjoyable family riding experience. With these funds we are able to bring in contractors to brush out and grade our ATV trails as well as fund employees to clean out culverts and water bars to prevent erosion, clear out blown down trees, and provide law enforcement and visitor services on the trail. Between these employees, contractors, and the many volunteers from local ATV clubs much of the work is done with out affecting the general Forest funds. This situation has allowed ATV use to continue on the Forest without actually affecting other popular user sites. Thank you for the opportunity to share with you how ATV registration fees are used on Federal lands.
435-1	**Comment:** *With regards to the article I read in the Vilas County News, I want to relay my feelings on the subject of the Forestry Department closing over half of the logging roads and trails in our national forest. What? was my first reaction. I have been a homeowner in the town of Alvin Wisconsin in Forest County for 31 years and have been hunting and fishing in the National Forests for over 50 years. Closing these logging roads and trails makes no sense and is a disservice to sportsmen, and others who enjoy our national Forests, including the elderly and disabled who rely on the roads. Why wasn't this put to a vote? The national forests belong to everyone. It is not right for a handful of people to make decisions like that - based on what?* **Response:** Thank you for your comments regarding our proposal for designating a network of motorized roads and trails. Please see response to comment 180-1 for a discussion on people with disabilities and response to 181-3 for a discussion of why we are implementing this project.
436-1	**Comment:** *It is my belief that as in 2004 the federal forest service will exactly what they want to do anyway, regardless of public opinion. In personally discussing the 2004 decision with forest personnel, the above statement was confirmed. The very fact that this notice was published in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel to start the "comment period" tells me your really don't want to hear from the people who will be affected the most. What is the distribution of the Milwaukee paper here in the region of the area affected?* **Response:** We appreciate your willingness to become involved. Please see response to comment 181-2 for a description of our public involvement and opportunities over the last 2 years.
436-2	**Comment:** *This forest is provided for by the taxes paid by the citizens of this country. With more and more regulations, access is being denied to those who have paid the longest. Some day will join the ranks of the less mobile population and wonder why some bureaucrat has seen fit to keep you out and keep you from returning to old haunts where so many good memories are because of age or handicaps. Drag a deer for a mile or so, which you probably have never done, and then say that ATVs should be kept out. This is just another move to restrict public lands to the hunting public; in other words anti-hunting move.* **Response:** Thank you so much for your review and input into this project, please see responses to letters 241-1 and 260-1.
437-1	**Comment:** *Assuming you have not made up your mind yet, I ask you, not to shut down the forest to hunters, fishermen and motorized use. The NF is supposed to be open to everyone, not just the select few. It is unreasonable to expect that most of the*

	people are able to hike to see the majority of lands that belong to all of us. If we are only able to see what is accessible on foot it will mean that at least 90% of us will see the first mile or two of our land. Particularly for us, who are aging, ill or handicapped, it seems as though you want us to become blacktop tourists, and go to a ranger station and look at movies of the forest, rather than experiencing the forest. **Response:** We appreciate your desire to continue to use the Forest. We believe our decision provides for a balance between motorized and non-motorized use. It also still provides plenty of access for every use. Please see responses to comment 180-1 for a discussion on people with disabilities and response to 181-3 for a discussion of why we are implementing this project.
437-2	**Comment:** *Likewise, if you keep hunters from the interior of the forest, how can Wisconsin manage the deer herd. Can you not work with the DNR and the public to keep these roads and trails open permanently.* **Response:** We understand the issue concerning the deer herd and work with the WDNR on this issue. Please see responses to comment 229-1 and comment 355-2 for information on deer herd management related to this project.
437-3	**Comment:** *Follow the chronology in the development of snowmobile trails. IT went from zero trails in the 1960s to 25,000 now. There is almost no-off trail riding because of the number of miles open. This same thing will happen with ATVs if a majority of the roads and trails are open.* **Response:** In our decision, we increased the number of miles of ATV trails from 318 to 334. On the west side of the Forest, we already have an adequate number of miles of roads available to ATVs; our decision added 71 miles of roads on the east side of the Forest.
437-4	**Comment:** *On Page 12 of the TNP, you mentioned the amount of miles around the forest. It is difficult to know why you mentioned this, but please don't make a dichotomy of the matter by saying that if there are many miles of trails and roads outside the forest, we don't need any inside the forest. This is particularly true of the Nicolet.* **Response:** Thank you for reviewing the EA. The EA includes a discussion of cumulative effects, which includes motorized opportunities available in surrounding private and public lands. The EA does not include a statement that trails are not "needed" inside the Forest. The decision includes 2,363 miles of road and 334 miles of trails available for motorized use. In addition, we will continue to develop opportunities for ATV trail use in accordance with the Forest Plan. Any new decisions for ATV trail development will be included on future MVUMs.
437-5	**Comment:** *What is non-significant to you is not necessarily to other people. Economics is the bottom line, which includes the Forest Service. A Calif. State report in 2007 said that OHV recreation in the state pumped an estimated $9 billion into the state's economy every year. In Arizona OHV use generated nearly $3 billion in retail sales in 2002. Parts of the monies when to support the FS. I will bet that you could use an increase in your budget and staffing. Open roads and trails will help this.* **Response:** Please understand we recognize the important of the National Forest and the opportunities they provide to local communities. It is important we continue to be good neighbors. We believe our decision provides a balance of both motorized and

	non-motorized use that communities and businesses can know will be available for long-term access to the Forest. Please see response to comment 339-4 for a discussion on the economic issue.
438-1	**Comment:** *Over a period, I've attempted to question and make some comment on the large-scale road system used by recreational ATV users compared to the paltry few trails left to other users in our national forest system. I have gotten notices of maps and proposals only to drive into Hayward to find out they never god there or were not available. My last call about the elk was nothing more than "like it or lump it". This apparently the attitude of late.* **Response:** The analysis in this project has been an effort to look at the National Forest road system as it relates to motorized recreation. Input from forest users has been sought throughout the process. Public responses to individual roads have been carefully considered and are often followed up with personal phone calls to understand concerns with the proposed road system. We apologize for any inconvenience caused on our part by not having maps available. They can currently be found at the district office and on the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest website: http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/cnnf/rec/tmr/index.html. A few roads within key elk calving areas have been closed seasonally to motorized traffic. Some of these roads are being considered for year round closure until a point in time when local WDNR elk biologists feel the impacts from motorized use to the elk population have been mitigated. These elk related closures will continue to be monitored every year in relation to elk population growth and risk to calves.
438-2	**Comment:** *Given the ostensible road building and the money spent for toilet and parking facilities, based solely for the use of ATV's, there has been little to nothing spent for hunter walking trails or really a somewhat good road into Pelican Lake about Stock Farm for the recreational products that fisherman could enjoy. The cost of trucking in gravel to build parking areas and other facilities for ATV traffic is well above a comparable and appropriate spending for other users. If this "lump" is spending more money for certain groups and catering to others, then that lump has certainly been accomplished. The new proposed map has several roads not even listed into Pelican lake and 327C is to be closed leaving no public access to the lake but from Stock Farm to Kenyon Road. 602 was gated off and is to be closed as well. It is certainly not fair to close off these roads so people who cannot walk a long distance will now be forced to not use the forest. Yet, at the same time Kenyon Road was wide, graveled two-laned road, well mowed and groomed.* **Response:** The National Forest is a cherished by many people for its varied recreational opportunities. These recreational activities are numerous and include both motorized and non-motorized uses. Funding for ATV trail and facility development comes primarily from ATV licensing and gas tax dollars. This funding is overseen by the WDNR which in turn provide grants to the Forest Service for trail maintenance and development. It can not be used for other types of recreational trails or roads. As a result of this funding system, ATV trails are much better funded than other types of recreational facilities. Both FR 327C and 602 into Pelican Lake are designated to remain open to motorized use. Across the Forest, 6,800 miles of road are open to motorized public travel providing access to many people. Motorized access is available to most lakes within the forest. Motorized access to a few of the smaller more remote lakes has been limited. Many people have requested the

	opportunity to experience the solitude provided by these types of areas.
438-3	**Comment:** *Apparently, the only users who have input are the greater lobbyists from the ATV clubs and the people who want to turn the national forest into a haven for timber wolves and elk, as we are told we have to stay away from "sensitive" areas so we do not cause them any harm. This is another lump that came from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and other groups that lobbied for their particular project. The lump might well be the continued loss of tourism to both Ashland and Sawyer county, which might well be one of the factors at work today - past very high gas prices. I know I'll not be sending anyone into the national forest again unless you want to look at ATV parking lots and maps with roads that are not listed or about to be closed. This is certainly a decline for the entire area and a mishandling of public property.* **Response:** Thank you for your concerns. All of the National Forest is open to the public. Existing motorize use into sensitive areas currently exists and in many cases roads within these areas will remain open with this decision. In areas where resource damage is currently occurring from motorized use, existing roads will be closed. Please see response to comment 339-4 for more information on the economic issue.
439-1	**Comment:** *Myself and my family uses the CNNF roads by walking, all terrain vehicles, and highway legal vehicles. At this time we as that you choose alternative 1 as your decision as to which proposal to pick as your final decision.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Many people expressed a similar comment. Please see response to comment 181-3.
439-2	**Comment:** *Our family also agrees that the seasonal use restrictions from March 15 to April 30 remain in effect.* **Response:** The general spring seasonal ATV closures you are referring to will remain in effect.
439-3	**Comment:** *We ask that you consider removing the closure of certain roads until July 1 of each year due to elk calving. The elk are not afraid of either ATVs or HLVs.* **Response: :** According to the Management Plan and Environmental Assessment for the Clam Lake Elk Herd (WDNR 2000; page 25-26) motorized vehicle use does affect elk habitat use. The WDNR (the State agency responsible for management of the Clam Lake Elk Herd) has indicated that limiting motorized use within areas used for calving would have a positive effect on the successful reproduction within this population. For these reasons, the decision limits motorized use, on roads in areas where elk habitat use is highest. (*Citation:* Wisconsin DNR. 2000. Management plan and environmental assessment for the Clam Lake elk herd. WDNR Bureau of Wildlife Management. 64 p.
439-4	**Comment:** *In looking at the CNNF alternative 3 maps provided by the Glidden Ranger Station, we ask the following roads not be closed: 184G, 1029, 1265A.* **Response:** See 403-1, 407-1, and 410-1 for responses related to FR 184G. FR 1029 is closed seasonally due to impacts associated with key elk calving areas. FR 1265A is a primary elk calving area and also allows access to an important lowland

	conifer wintering area. This road is closed year round to minimize human impacts to elk at both of these times.
440-1	**Comment:** *Enclosed is a letter I received from my constituents [names removed]. [Names removed] are concerned that the Forest Service put a gate across a road which would bar access to their blackberry patch due to their being disabled. Their property is located in Suring Wisconsin and their contact number is [personal info not displayed].* **Response:** The District Ranger contacted these individuals. The area of concern is Forest Service Road 2839 off of Lower Dam Road. This road closure is within a semi-primitive non-motorized area designated by the Record of Decision for the 2004 Land and Resource Management Plan. The closure was put in place to implement the Forest Plan and provide for non-motorized recreation.
441-1	**Comment:** *What is important, essential, is that the land be protected! There are other places one can hunt and fish, and ride ATVs. Native Americans know the importance of the land. To quote from one Indian Chief, "When it's gone, it's gone forever". We have a moral responsibility to be stewards of the land.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. Many people felt as you do. Please see response to comment 185-1 and the Decision Notice for a description of the selected alternative and our rationale.
442-1	**Comment:** *I am writing in response to the Travel Management Project that is now open for public comment. I am totally opposed to this plan and the direction the Forest Service has been going for the past 20 years or so. This plan is just another restriction on public land passed onto the forest user by certain key government officials who have their own special interest and mission in mind on how the forest should operate. These key government leaders should be reminded that the United States Congress had a mission and purpose when they passed legislation (Organic Act 1897 and the Clarke McNary Act of 1924) for the management of National Forests. The mission and purpose of these laws have never be REVOKED! I do believe a forest supervisor, regional forester, or even the chief forester has the right or authority to override the Congress of the United States of America. Enough said on the laws of the United States and the interpretation of such laws by Forest Service officials. I now must turn to the original agreement between the United States Forest Service and the Forest County government which created the Nicolet National Forest. My research into this matter came up with the following: On May 14, 1928, Forest Service Assistant Chief Kneipp, Regional Forester E.W. Tinker addressed the Forest County Board. In his conference notes, Assistant Chief Kneipp stated, "The purpose of the United States in buying these lands is to restore them to a condition of maximum forest product activity by intense management, planting, fire protection, etc. to make them source of permanent timber supply and basis for permanent wood-using industries and communities. I think it is reasonable to conclude that management of the National Forest in Wisconsin follows a different philosophy than what the county supervisors were lead to believe when the counties approved the purchase of this land back in the late 1920s and early 1930s.* **Response:** We take our responsibilities for managing these lands seriously. We understand the importance of these lands to the counties and the people who live and work here. We must balance the management and use of the CNNF to ensure the

	sustainability of these lands for the people over the long run. We believe this decision provides that balance, but we also understand the importance of a feedback process especially to ensure adequate public access. Let us hear from you if there are specific roads or areas that you feel do not have adequate access provided.
442-2	**Comment:** *As I read further in to this Travel Management Plan, it says I must select one of these three alternatives and it will go into effect January 2009. As I read over the three alternatives, I cannot put support behind any one of these alternatives as the environmental analysis does not do the complete job as to the impacts (socio-economic) to the communities. I must stop writing this letter now and pick some raspberries on Forest Service land before they tell me I need a special-use permit to do this also!* **Response:** Your continued use of the National Forest is something we intend to preserve. We understand why you cannot chose between alternatives, but we appreciate you sharing your concerns. Although we will likely not be able to maintain all the roads people have used historically, we intend to try and keep open an adequate amount to ensure you and others have access to do the things you enjoy doing on the CNNF.
443-1	**Comment:** *I wish to protest your plan to close roads and trails in the Chequamegon-Nicolet NF. As a 76 year old senior citizen I have had many health problems and will never be able to use your many walking trails. We have been snowmobiling and 4-wheeling in the Chequamegon Forest since 1969 and feel that as a local citizen we are being treated unfairly.* **Response:** We understand and appreciate your desire to continue to use the Forest. We welcome individuals of all abilities. Please note that in our decision, on the Chequamegon side of the Forest, the roads designated for ATV use are relatively unchanged and were put in place as a result of implementing our 2004 Forest Plan. The number of miles of trails available to ATVs has increased from 318 miles to 334 miles. Please let us know if your use of specific roads is changing with our decision and we will consider them in our future updates to the motor vehicle use map. Also note that our decision does not affect access for snowmobiles. This project only addresses wheeled motorized vehicles. Please also see response to comment 339-5.
444-1	**Comment:** *This letter is against the changes you are proposing for closing forest roads, logging roads, etc. in the national forest. As a home owner in the national forest we will be prevented from using our 4-wheelers, snowmobiles, and cross country motorcycles as we have in the past 40 years. We would have to trailerize them to locations for riding. At 76 years of age it is next to impossible for my wife and myself. Your plans have totally disregarded the residents who live in the Chequamegon Forest as we have since 1965.* **Response:** Thank you for your letter and letting us know how you use the Forest. The roads where ATV use is currently allowed on the Chequamegon side of the Forest will change only slightly with our decision on this project. Most of the current roads that are available for ATV use were put in place as a result of our 2004 Forest Plan. Motorcycles are allowed anywhere an ATV is allowed. The number of miles of trails available to ATVs has increased from 318 mile to 334 miles. Please let us know if your use of specific roads is changing with our decision and we will consider them in our future updates to the motor vehicle use map. Also note that our decision does not affect access for snowmobiles. This project only addresses wheeled motorized vehicles.

444-2	**Comment:** *We have logging trails next to our property on 40-60 acres of national forest land that we have been using along with our kids and grandkids. These trails are safe from the "weekend warriors". These trails would not be able to be used under your plan. The Torch Trail 1265 and 1265A have been passed around yearly about being closed because of the Elk Foundation's wishes to protect the elk. I understand the closing during calving season but do not understand why 1265A and 1029 - Mother Lodge Road would have to be closed the remaining 9-10 months. When the elk first arrived we supported the foundation and were told that no changes would be made. We certainly didn't expect to have the forest shut down.* **Response:** FR 1265A is a primary elk calving area and also allows access to an important lowland conifer wintering area. This road is closed year round to minimize human impacts to elk at both of these times. FR 1029 will be closed only during the elk calving season, similar to FR1265. These elk related closures will continue to be monitored every year in relation to elk population growth and risk to calves.
444-3	**Comment:** *Years ago when the Nicolet National Forest was closed to motorized vehicles it was predicted by the local residents that our forest would be next and it is becoming a reality. At this time we have 16 licenses for our ATV's, snowmobiles, watercraft, and motorcycles that have been used by our family and friends. These will more than likely have to be disposed of with the conditions that we are facing. Although I believe this program is already a "done deal" I think it is not the answer to the problem.* **Response:** National Forests are used by the public for multiple purposes. When properly managed, OHV use is a legitimate use of National Forest lands. The intent of the proposed change in OHV management on National Forests is to provide sustainable OHV use while limiting environmental impacts. Please note that in our decision, on the Chequamegon side of the Forest, the roads designated for ATV use are relatively unchanged and were put in place as a result of implementing our 2004 Forest Plan. The number of miles of trails available to ATVs has increased from 318 mile to 334 miles. Please let us know if your use of specific roads is changing with our decision and we will consider them in our future updates to the motor vehicle use map. Also note that our decision does not affect access for snowmobiles. This project only addresses wheeled motorized vehicles.
445-1	**Comment:** *I am writing in response to the Forest Service proposal to drastically reduce roads open to vehicle traffic in the Chequamegon-Nicolet NF. Our national forests belong to all of the American public and we should be allowed access to the majority of it. Whatever happened to the multiple use concept.* **Response:** Thank you for taking the time to write and share your concerns. We understand the importance of having access to the National Forest for a variety of uses. This decision is not intended to shut you out or to drastically reduce the miles of road you have available to use. However, it is important that we manage the roads and trails so they can be sustained for your access over the long term. Many of the roads that will not show up as available for use on the MVUM are currently inaccessible; however, we know that many of these roads are also being used. We want to ensure we are providing an adequate amount of roads for access. Please let us know if there are specific areas you utilize.
445-2	**Comment:** *Why would you propose closing these roads to motorized traffic when they allow the public to access the forest and*

	enjoy it? Many people do not have the time or physical ability to visit the forest area on foot. Only an elite few would be able to access this acreage. **Response:** The response to your concerns is included in response to comment 445-1.
445-3	**Comment:** *It is very unfortunate that few people in a position of power can take away the privilege of being able to enjoy our wonderful forest resource from the tax payers who "own" the land. Have the environmental extremists been allowed to influence your decision to this extent? If not, how can you justify closing roads?* **Response:** The response to your concerns is included in response to comment 445-1.
445-4	**Comment:** *We need more acres and miles of roads and trails to provide recreation for hunters, fishermen, trappers, ATV and snowmobile riders and vehicle traffic for the enjoyment of driving our national forests.* **Response:** The response to your concerns is included in response to comment 445-1.
445-5	**Comment:** *This appears to be a move by a bureaucratic government agency to drastically limit the opportunity for thousands of citizens from using our national forest resources.* **Response:** The response to your concerns is included in response to comment 445-1.
446-1	**Comment:** *There are plenty of trails for people that want to get away from the concrete world. I am 64 years old and I need my truck to get back in to fish and hunt. I have 2 artificial hips and one knee. Every day you and I lose a little more freedom in this country, and this is one of them. Keep it as least restricted as possible.* **Response:** We appreciate your desire to continue to use the Forest. Our decision provides for a sustainable network of designated roads and trails for motorized use and also provides for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. If there are particular roads that you use for hunting and fishing, please let us know and we will consider them in future updates to the MVUM. The more specific you can be with your requests, the better we can serve your needs. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for an explanation of this process. Please also see response to comment 260-1.
447-1	**Comment:** *I can't tell you how disappointed I was to read in the local and state papers about closing 55% of the roads in the nearby National Forest. I had no idea this plan was in the works. My sons and I have hunted in the Forest just east of Eagle River for years and never dreamed any such thing could happen. It's the only time we get together. I'm up in years so the closing won't affect me much, but my boys have enjoyed the area immensely. We have no land of our own to hunt so we depend on this land for our annual hunt. I'd like to go on record as opposing the road closings. At a time when so much land is in private hands it seems to me that folks in my situation will feel forgotten. The situation will only worsen over the years, I'm sure. I think this is a horrendous error on the departments part at a time when the DNR is trying so hard to encourage more people to hunt.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing how you and your family use the Forest. It is important to us that you be able to continue to

	do so. We encourage you stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
447-2	**Comment:** *We hunt in the area near roads 2174 and 2175. How will we be affected? There was no mention of specific roads to be closed! Will all the main roads remain open? I'm not clear on this. I will look forward to more information on this issue.* **Response:** FR 2174 and FR 2175 are both main roads maintained by the town. Town roads are not affected by this project. They will continue to remain open and available to public use. There are 46 Forest system roads along FR 2174 and FR 2175, 8 of which are closed and 38 open. These 38 open system roads will continue to be open for highway legal vehicles. According to our records, there are 5 open unauthorized roads along FR 2174 and FR 2175. There weren't any public or internal comments about these 5 roads so they won't be available for public use when the 2009 Motorized Use Vehicle Map is published. Please let us know if any of these roads are important to you and we will consider them in our next update.
448-1	**Comment:** *My family hunts bear with hounds in Northern Bayfield County. We really need motorized vehicle access to hunt the forest in order to manage the bear populations and pursue our short get to game - retrieve dogs, etc., and get them out.* **Response:** We realize that our decision may change how you use this Forest. We also understand that the Forest is used for many different reasons. They are all important. Because we are concerned about how the decision will affect your ability to use and enjoy the Forest, we will continue to listen to your specific suggestions to designate specific roads and trails for motor vehicle use, and will continue to incorporate your suggestions in the future as we prepare subsequent MVUMs. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for an explanation of this process.
448-2	**Comment:** *I'm not worried about wolves, they seem to be doing better than our dogs they attack.* **Response:** Wolves were not the reason for any roads being unavailable for motorized use. While one of the outcomes of this project would be a reduction in the number of miles of open roads within wolf pack territories, it is not one of the purposes of this project.
449-1	**Comment:** *Alternative 2 is preferable because it addresses the perceived need for additional routes available for ATV use, while, at the same time, reduces the length of routes available for motorized use in the forest by 2548 or 2577 miles. This reduction, as a trade-off for an additional 58 miles of routes available for ATV use on the West side of the forest, will greatly benefit wildlife, plants and water resources on the forest.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concerns and perspective. We believe the decision is a balance in providing both motorized and non-motorized use.

449-2	**Comment:** *By closing more motorized routes to motorized use of any kind, Alt 2 helps reduce the spread of non-native invasive plant species in the Forest. This also means that wildlife and their habitat will not be as disturbed as they are now (Alternative 1) or would be under Alternative 3, which closes fewer existing routes to vehicular traffic and opens up more routes for ATV use (84 miles, including 22 on the East/Nicolet of the Forest).* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concerns. The decision provides a balance between providing access and protecting resources. We will continue to monitor and update the map to ensure this balance is maintained.
449-3	**Comment:** *As the Forest Service has noted, there reportedly are 700 miles of ATV routes in the state, and 500 of these are in counties in or near the East side of the CNNF. There is an ATV route from Lakewood to Laona, and Forest County offers an extensive ATV system near Crandon. Apparently, there is a perceived need for more ATV routes on the West side of the forest; there is no need to further disturb habitat on the East side.* **Response:** The2004 Forest Plan provides guidance to expand the miles of ATV trails developed and available for public use. This development will continue to be proposed and evaluated on a site-specific basis.
449-4	**Comment:** *In my experience, four-wheel drive SUVs and pick-up trucks actually cause much more damage and destruction to the Forest than the smaller, lighter ATVs. The large 4WD vehicles tear up the trails so much that hiking them is difficult, and biking them is impossible. This is why the physical barriers are needed.* **Response:** We will continue to provide a balance of roads and trails for motorized use including ATVs and four-wheel drive vehicles; however, we will continue to monitor the use and if unacceptable damage is occurring we will take steps to address..
449-5	**Comment:** *Although routes formerly open to motorized use would be closed for that purpose under Alts 2 and 3, the plan as it exists now provides for no barricades to block access to the newly closed routes. Perhaps this is for economic reasons, but using a new "map" as an "enforcement tool" will not work. Maps provide directions; they are not tools of any kind. They are made of paper; they cannot be expected to do the job of a barricade. I have heard that the Forest Service is concerned that putting up barricades on some routes will only force law breakers to turn to other, unobstructed trails. That may be. But the argument belies the reality that, unless access is physically blocked, motorized vehicles will use the routes. If no barriers are put up, individuals who drove motorized vehicles on the routes previously open to that use are going to use them the same way. They won't have to look for another trail. Thus, the need to barricade all routes that are closed to vehicular traffic. Otherwise, all this planning and supposed "closing" of routes to motorized use is just a wink and a nod. If Alt 2 is not revised to provide for the barricades, all that happens is that more routes are available for ATV use and the miles of routes available for all motorized use remains the same. That would be a perversion of Alt 1, and a travesty for the Forest.* **Response:** The MVUM will help guide people to where they can legally ride their wheeled motorized vehicles. We will continue to evaluate all roads on the Forest sites-specifically to determine which roads we will maintain for long term use and which roads will be physically closed. These decisions will be made on a project specific basis which will include public involvement. As a

	result we expect the MVUM will change over time.
450-1	**Comment:** *I am writing to comment on the alternatives selected for the Travel Management Project. I am especially concerned about access in the Nicolet Forests section since I am a property owner and frequent user. I am very familiar with the roads, trails and destinations in the Nicolet and particularly in the Eagle River-Florence district. I have degrees in both earth sciences and geography. I have also spent over 1000 full days (and many nights) hunting, fishing, hiking, kayaking, canoeing, snowmobiling, and driving in the Nicolet National Forest.* **Response:** Thank you for commenting on the alternatives in our EA. It is clear that you use the Forest a great deal and it's important to us that you are able to continue to do so.
450-2	**Comment:** *I am especially concerned that alternatives 2 and 3 do not address the needs of the public regarding forest access. I support alternative 1 which as I understand it would be no change in current access.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are implanting this project..
450-3	**Comment:** *Both Alternatives 2 and 3 severely restrict travel in the forest with any type of motorized vehicle and offer little in the way of an additional recreational opportunities in the Nicolet. They do in fact limit recreational opportunities only to improved spec roads and gravel roads and these plans cannot be improved without massive changes.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 184-1 for a discussion on the different jurisdictions of roads and how they are affected (or not) by this decision. As a result of our decision, 6,800 miles of roads will continue to be available for your use.
450-4	**Comment:** *Both alternatives 2 and 3 involve closing too many of the roads used by many of those who visit and live in northern Wisconsin. This will affect everyone but especially the young, elderly and disabled. These groups are not able to walk long distances through uneven terrain. It will be difficult or impossible to get to stream access points, berry picking areas, scenic areas and hunting areas normally used.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 180-1 for a discussion on access for disabled individuals.
450-5	**Comment:** *We shouldn't need a "reason" to be in the forest. We have a right to be there and to be able to get there without the Forest Service erecting barriers and obstacles.* **Response:** We as managers are charged with managing the National Forest in accordance with the laws ands and regulations that Congress has put in place to ensure the long-term use and protection of the Forest. We understand the importance of public access to these public lands. It is our responsibility to manage to provide the balance between use and protection. We will continue to take this responsibility seriously.

450-6	**Comment:** *I also believe that closing roads will concentrate vehicle traffic on the remaining open roads. This will cause degradation of these remaining roads. I can already predict the Forest Service will close even more roads in the future because of poor road conditions.* **Response:** The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). Plus, we are maintaining the same number of ATV trail miles with this decision (334 miles). We believe this avoids forcing people into smaller areas or concentrating them on other roads. We conduct annual monitoring of road and trail conditions and will take results into consideration in future updates to the MVUM
450-7	**Comment:** *I also believe that closing roads will concentrate vehicle traffic on the remaining open roads. This will cause degradation of these remaining roads. I can already predict the Forest Service will close even more roads in the future because of poor road conditions.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 450-6.
450-8	**Comment:** *I am also a snowmobiler and although the plan is said to not affect snowmobile travel on roads that are off the designated snowmobile trails, the ultimate affect of these alternatives will close them. Restricted motor vehicle access will cause the closed roads to eventually grow or be blocked by blown down trees and effectively eliminate either use by snowmobiles by bicycles, cross country skiers or even as walking trails.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 450-6.
450-9	**Comment:** *Although I am not an ATV user, the miles added in the Nicolet for ATV use are obviously inadequate. I see no need to crated specific designated ATV trails. I believe the solution lies in the cooperation with snowmobile clubs who already have designated trail networks that go where people want to travel. I think the Forest Service should let the ATV riders work this out with the local snowmobile clubs to share use and maintenance. This, combined with township and municipal rules for ATV use on low standard public roads would solve this problem and I am sure would satisfy the ATV riders. There would need to be restrictions in wet areas and restrictions on cross country travel but these exceptions could be overcome without nearly as much effort as has already been expended.* **Response:** The 2004 Forest Plan provides the opportunity to develop up to 85 miles of trail on the Nicolet side of the Forest and 100 miles for trail on the Chequamegon side of the Forest. We will continue to cooperate, with ATV, snowmobile, and other clubs on motorized recreation opportunities on the CNNF. We are working with several towns and clubs on potential opportunities for trail development.
450-10	**Comment:** *I understand that there are groups that want roads closed to motor vehicle traffic. Some want a remote wilderness experience. We have plenty of unroaded wilderness areas now where no vehicle of any kind is allowed. We don't need more.*

	Response: Thank you for your comment.
450-11	**Comment:** *My advice to the Forest Service is to leave all existing roads open. They do not need to be "maintained" or even kept clear. Individual users will do that for you. If the road has no value travel will eventually cease and the forest will reclaim the road by itself and grow over. There are thousands of examples of this now. I have noticed that the total number of roads has been significantly reduced naturally over the 40 years I have been using the Forest.* **Response:** Please see response to 181-3 for an explanation as to why choosing Alternative 1 would be irresponsible for us as land managers.
451-1	**Comment:** *The closing of any national forest roads is completely unacceptable to us tax payers who support forest management for our enjoyment.* **Response:** We understand your position. Please be assured that as land managers, we take our responsibilities very seriously. Please see responses to comments 181-3 for a discussion of discussion of why we are implementing this project and 201-1 for a discussion of our mission.
451-2	**Comment:** *Wolves don't pay any taxes as we do, so they should not be a factor for road closures in any way, shape, or form period.* **Response:** Wolves were not the reason for any roads being unavailable for motorized use. While one of the outcomes of this project would be a reduction in the number of miles of open roads within wolf pack territories, it is not one of the purposes of this project.
451-3	**Comment:** *I am partially disabled and others in a large organization I belong to either are disable or older hunters and fishermen who utilize the national forest extensively.* **Response:** We welcome people of all abilities to the Forest. We believe there are a variety of options available to everyone. Please see response to comment 180-1.
451-4	**Comment:** *If roads would be closed, they would have to be opened for logging to help pay for forests costs and benefit wildlife.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concerns. We continue to propose site-specific projects to implement the goals in the Forest Plan. These include active management of the Forest to provide habitat for many wildlife species. It is also important to note our decision does not affect access for administrative purposes, such as logging. It will not affect our ability to continue to manage the Forest, including access for timber harvest and fire suppression. Please also see response to comment 340-3.
451-5	**Comment:** *Our organization has some major funds and if one mile of road is proposed to be closed there will be a major lawsuit.* **Response:** This is an appealable decision pursuant to CFR 215. Please see the Decision Notice for your opportunity to appeal

	and the requirements for submitting an appeal.
452-1	**Comment:** *I agree with the concept of the travel management project, but feel that the economic and environmental impact has not been fully explored.* **Response:** The economic impacts of motorized use in Wisconsin are controversial (see Recreation report). We understand that people easily reach the conclusions you state in your comment. Unfortunately, we did not find any definitive conclusion that supports that our decision will result in an adverse economic effect to local economies. We found in our research that motor vehicle use can benefit both tourism and related dollars to local communities. However, we also found countering costs due to increased law enforcement needs and environmental damage. Finally, we found no evidence in our research that concentrating motorized use on fewer roads will reduce recreation overall. Please see Appendix A to this document for more information. Please also see the Environmental Assessment and the resource specialist reports for a discussion on the environmental impacts of this project.
452-2	**Comment:** *As our hunting community ages there are not enough youth entering the hunting community to replace those that are leaving. When the Forest Service limits access to vast areas of public land it removes hunting opportunity. If hunters do not have a place to hunt many leave the sport. I know the areas will be open to walk in but in my case I am 68 years old and have bad knees and am unable to walk more than a quarter of a mile.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concerns regarding hunting. We believe that our decision provides plenty of access for everyone which includes a balance between motorized and non-motorized access. We have found no evidence that hunters will only hunt where motorized access is allowed. We have heard from other hunters who prefer a non-motorized experience and support our proposals. We encourage you stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
452-3	**Comment:** *I have been hunting in the Nicolet National Forest since 1966. The area I hunt is 1.7 miles inside the Nicolet National Forest. I presently drive across private property and down a logging road to the area I hunt. This road is scheduled to be gated. Thus I will be unable to hunt this area. I was unable to deer hunt in 2007 because it was painful to walk at all. I had planned on hunting this 2008 but if the road is gated it will mean my hunting days are over.* **Response:** We are unsure of the area in which you hunt, but if you are accessing it off of private lands it is likely that we would not designate public motorized use if the only access is off of private lands. If there is access to this area from Forest Service roads, please let us know specifically which roads you use for your hunting activities and we will consider them in our next update to the MVUM. Also note that we will not be putting any gates in place with the decision on this project. Decisions to install closure devices are made on site-specific projects. Lastly, the designated network of roads and trails as described in our decision will take effect in January 2009; therefore, the fall 2008 hunting season is unaffected.

452-4	**Comment:** *I am not the only person that is in this predicament. If more hunters quit that means fewer deer harvested and the deer population grows. After a few years of unchecked deer propagation the forest will suffer from over browsing.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 355-2 for a discussion on deer management.
452-5	**Comment:** *As more hunters quit this will have an economic impact on the surrounding area. Fewer hunters mean less money spent in grocery stores, gas stations, taverns (not a bad thing), and sporting good stores.* **Response:** Please see response to your previous comment, 452-1
452-6	**Comment:** *The less money spent on outdoors articles means less money for the Pittman-Robison funds which some of the money goes for purchasing lands for hunting and outdoor activities.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
452-7	**Comment:** *When hunting opportunities are taken away it starts a domino effect that affects hundreds if not thousands of people's lives.* **Response:** Hunting is an important activity on the National Forest. This decision is not intended to affect hunting opportunities. No place on the Forest is closed to hunting. The focus of this effort is to map where public motorized vehicle use can occur. Hunters have expressed a desire for both motorized and non-motorized access. It is important to provide a balance of these opportunities which we believe this decision does; however, if there are specific areas you believe you will no longer have access to please let us know.
452-8	**Comment:** *I respectfully request that the Travel Management plan be revisited so the people of the state of Wisconsin do not lose the opportunity to enjoy the public lands within its borders. Public lands should be managed in the best interest of all citizens.* **Response:** As land managers, we take our Agency's mission very seriously, especially when it pertains to sustaining the health, diversity, and productivity of this Forest to meet the needs of present and future generations. Please see response to comment 201-2 for a discussion on the Forest Service mission.
453-1	**Comment:** *In regards to the Travel Management project, the plan I would like to see is Alternative 1 (no action). I thought the forest was for public use - why cut a means of using it. Leave the roads as they are.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your opinion and concerns. Please see response to comment 181-3.
454-1	**Comment:** *The Society supports the selection of Alternative 1, allowing the existing open road condition to remain in place and making open or closed decisions during local site specific Forest Plan Implementation Projects. Rather than a blanket Forest proposal that has had limited public involvement and whose enforcement capability is highly questionable, the local land*

	managers can make every effort to involve those most affected by closures, the local landowner and recreational users of that area. **Response:** Thank you for sharing your opinion and concerns. Please see response to comment 181-3. As we go forward with annual updates to the MVUM, we will be incorporating road management decisions included in site specific projects. Public involvement was and will continue to be an important aspect of this project; please see response to comment 181-2, and the Decision Notice or an explanation of our public involvement process.
454-2	**Comment:** *Ruffed grouse and woodcock hunting is a primary recreational use of the Forest each fall with many of the over 100,000 hunters in pursuit of these species in Wisconsin hunting on the Forest. Data from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources list two of the top three counties (Forest and Price) in the state for ruffed grouse hunting within the Forest boundary. Clearly these public lands are crucial to these recreational users.* **Response:** We agree that the Forest is used extensively for bird hunting. We have heard from hunters that prefer a motorized experience as well as those hunters who prefer a non-motorized experience. We believe that our decision provides for that balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. We encourage you to stay involved with site specific project planning and also to let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest may be important to you and your members as we continue with this process. We will consider any site specific input in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
454-3	**Comment:** *Access of the National Forest is important to ruffed grouse and woodcock hunters. Though some ruffed grouse and woodcock hunters prefer to walk long distances in pursuit of their prey, others do much of their hunting from or in close proximity of a motor vehicle. However, even to the walking grouse or woodcock hunter the ability to be in relatively close proximity (less than a mile) to their eventual destination is desired. With that in mind the Society is very concerned that the two action alternatives in the EA reduce the amount of roads open for motor vehicle use so significantly at this time (55% decrease in Alternative 2, 54% decrease in Alternative 3). We feel that decreasing the amount of roads open to motor vehicles to this level will significantly reduce recreational use of the Forest especially by one of its major user groups, the recreational hunter.* **Response:** It is not our intent to reduce access for the recreational hunter; however, it is important we only place roads on the MVUM that are appropriate for motor vehicle use. The process we have incorporated into the decision should allow opportunities for feedback to place roads that are used on the map after an evaluation process. In the meantime we will continue the process of site specifically assessing all roads. Please see response to comment 184-1 for information on the percentage of roads on the Forest and the various jurisdictions.
454-4	**Comment:** *While we can support fall seasonal access for motorized vehicles on additional miles as proposed in Alternative 3, we wonder why these roads are not just considered for year round use. Very little use of the majority of these roads occurs after December 15th and before July 1st. In most years, environmental conditions like snow cover and spring breakup prevent use of the high majority of low maintenance roads on the Forest from December 15th until May 1st. Use of many of these roads*

	remains low in May and June unless the road provides access for fishing areas or firewood gathering. Increases may occur in some areas with the opening of the black bear training season in July but even this travel is often limited to weekends. Without a doubt the most significant use of most of the low maintenance roads on the Forest occurs during the fall hunting seasons. **Response:** The roads designated in the selected alternative for fall access were designated as such because of wildlife considerations and are in accordance with Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines.
454-5	**Comment:** *The accompanying Road Analysis Report does a good job identifying what each surveyed road is used for as well as potential resource conflicts that may be present but misses a crucial bit of information, when the use occurs and the amount of use that is occurring. If that information was presented it most likely would show that use of many of these forest roads is very seasonable and tied to one main user group, the recreational hunter. We suggest that except for blatant resource and safety concerns use restrictions should not be placed on the existing roads open to motor vehicles on the Forest. It is disappointing that very little mention is made in this analysis of the importance of forest roads to the recreational hunter. While mentioned as a user group in the EA, the accompanying Recreation Report has little mention of this important recreational user group that will be most effected by these proposed changes. While a few paragraphs are devoted to hunting opportunities in the Biological Evaluations and Other Wildlife Considerations Report, it does little to quantify the high use each fall of the Forest by hunters and the importance of access to this important user group across the entire Forest land base.* **Response:** We are very well aware of the importance of the CNNF to those that hunt and fish. We also know from our users surveys this is one of the primary reasons people visit the Forest. We want to ensure we provide adequate access for all hunting experiences. Feedback as we implement this process will be essential to understand how well we are balancing those needs.
454-6	**Comment:** *The Society questions the determinations made for some of the wildlife species identified in the Biological Evaluation (BE). The BE states that species like the northern goshawk, bald eagle and red shouldered hawk will have a beneficial impact from the additional reduction of low level roads in Alternatives 2 and 3. Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines are already in place that restricts activities near all known territories on the Forest for these and other species from February 15 to August 1, well beyond their breeding seasons. In addition, since little use of low level roads by motor vehicles actually occur on the Forest for the majority of the year and through most, if not all, of the breeding season for these species this beneficial determination is a stretch. In all likelihood, little if any impact would occur for these species as a result of the implementation of any Alternative.* **Response:** The Beneficial Impact determination for some of the RFSS species (e.g., wolf, eagle, goshawk, red-shouldered hawk) evaluated assumes that disturbances associated with motorized travel would be less likely to occur because there would be significant reductions in the miles of roads open to motorized travel. The actual benefit may be negligible because, as you point out, protection measures are already in place (through 2004 Forest Plan) to greatly reduce the disturbance to RFSS species. In arriving at a determination in the effects analysis for RFSS, the analyst must choose among several specific conclusions (e.g., Beneficial Impact, No Impact, May Impact Individuals) but because information is often information and because adverse impacts are often avoided through project design, the determination is often based on an unquantified measure of risk (Strong 1994). Such was the case for this project where the effects of Alternatives 2 and 3 are expected to be, at least,

	inconsequential to most RFSS and, potentially, beneficial to the species. (*Citation:* Strong, P.I.V. 1994. Viability analysis in biological evaluations. Conservation Biology 8: 927-928.
454-7	**Comment:** *In addition, in the analysis for the gray wolf in the BE there is no mention that despite the existing number of open low level roads across the Forest, the gray wolf population has prospered and is currently well above the targeted management level for Wisconsin. There is also no reference to the documented fact that gray wolves use low level roads as travel ways. Most likely the closure of additional roads as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3 really would have little impact on the gray wolf population as they obviously have not been impacted by the current higher level of open roads.* **Response:** It was mentioned in the BE (page 16) that wolf territories are "nearly ubiquitous on the Chequamegon landbase and are becoming more prevalent on the Nicolet landbase." Although it was not stated in the BE, you are correct that the wolf population in Wisconsin has prospered in the current system of open roads. As you note, wolves do use low-standard roads as travelways, but this use was not judged to be consequential to the analysis because the existing roads will remain open to wolves for the foreseeable future whether or not they are designated for a public motorized use.
454-8	**Comment:** *Another main concern of this proposal is the ability of the Forest to insure compliance with any new restrictions imposed. Statements from Forest Service officials have indicated that funding may not be available to properly close roads and that compliance will most likely consist of users being provided with a motor vehicle use map (MVUM). It would then be up to the user to figure out exactly where they are on the Forest and what limitations if any are present on their use of that road. This would require maps that are 100% accurate, something even the current maps provided with this analysis are lacking. At the very least, signage should be used to clearly show those routes that are open to motor vehicle use. Conflicts between users trying to be legal and those ignoring the restrictions can be anticipated, not a desirable situation for Forest users.* **Response:** Physically closing roads with a barrier, such as gates, rocks, or berms, will not occur with this project's decision. This type of action would occur with site-specific projects. We agree with your comment regarding signage. The Forest is committed to signing the roads and trails on the designated network with a road number. This road number coupled with the MVUM will allow the Forest visitor to determine where he or she can legally use a motor vehicle.
455-1	**Comment:** *I would like to express my support for Alternative #1 of the National Forest Service proposals for the travel management rule in the Nicolet National Forest for the following reasons: Closing all of these roads will restrict access to the forest for most people, especially the young and elderly. Closing roads will concentrate vehicle traffic on the remaining roads, destroying them. I can already predict they will have to close even more roads in the future because of poor road conditions. The chance to get away from people will be difficult and ruin the experience of the north woods. It will be hard or impossible to get to stream access points, berry picking areas, scenic areas and hunting areas normally used. Closing roads caters only to the elite users like cross country skiers, bicyclers, hikers, and those who don't want people in the woods for some reason. We have plenty of unroaded wilderness areas now where no vehicles of any kind are allowed. We don't need more. The logging roads in the Nicolet are not like mountain roads in the west or congested areas in the east. These roads do very little if any environmental*

	damage. The access they provide far out weighs any risk (also in letters 455–488). **Response:** Many people expressed similar comments; please see response to comment 181-3. We welcome visitors of all ages and all abilities and we believe we provide adequate access for everyone; please see response to comment 260-1. We encourage you remain involved in our process and let us know specifically which roads are important to you. We will consider any suggested roads for inclusion in our subsequent MVUMs. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of this process.
489-1	**Comment:** *The Alternative 1 no action proposal provides the most use opportunities for motorized recreational vehicles. Because 61% more mile of road will be available than either Alternative 2 or 3, this will maintain the same level of consistency as the existing condition. I oppose Alternatives 2 and 3 because it would be a reduction in travel areas for motorized use recreation opportunities. One of our most enjoyable activities is exploring the Northwoods with its beauty and serenity. We do not damage any wildlife and are respectful of all of the areas we visit. We would love to continue to enjoy nature as we have it.* **Response:** Many people expressed similar comments; please see response to comment 181-3. We welcome visitors of all ages and all abilities and we believe we provide adequate access for everyone; please see response to comment 260-1. We encourage you remain involved in our process and let us know specifically which roads are important to you. We will consider any suggested roads for inclusion in our subsequent MVUMs. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of this process.
490-1	**Comment:** *I have reviewed the EA and find that the USFS has done a good job of balancing vehicle use and hence users with protection, management, and restoration of the natural resources on the Forest. I support the preferred Alternative 2 and request that you select this alternative.* **Response:** Thank you for reviewing the EA and providing us this input. Please see the Decision Notice for a description of the selected alternative.
491-1	**Comment:** *I understand that there are mistakes from the past concerning some of the access roads that need to be corrected. This may involve some unauthorized roads or some roads that are not property constructed in sensitive areas. For that reason, I do not support the status quo. I am very concerned about the restrictiveness of the other two proposals. Access to the forest is key for users to enjoy this wonderful natural resource. It seems that the other two proposals unreasonably restrict access to potential forest users. I used to be an avid backpacker and hiker. Now I am older and find that I cannot do some of the things on foot like I used to. For me, it is important to have motorized access to forest areas. One reason is simple access: motorized transport can get me further into the forest than my ability to walk. The second is that using a motorcycle, truck, or ATV is much like motorized hiking for me. I get to see and enjoy the forest where I otherwise would be limited in doing so. I know that some say there is a conflict between motorized users and non-motorized users. I have spent a lot of time in public forests over the years and find that there is little contact or conflict between these groups. My experience in other forests around the country is that there are simple ways to allow for mixed use and exclusive use that area reasonable and proportionate. Some forests have*

	quiet areas, wilderness areas, or other non-motorized areas that are reasonable in size and allow non-motorized users to have exclusive use without contact with other users. These are working forests and can accommodate a wide variety of activity. **Response:** Thank you for sharing how you use the Forest. Your use is important to us. We believe our decision does exactly what you suggest by providing a balance between motorized and non-motorized uses. Our Forest does have areas for non-motorized use such as our wilderness areas and our non-motorized semi-primitive areas. We encourage you remain involved in our process and let us know specifically which roads are important to you. We will consider any suggested roads for inclusion in our subsequent MVUMs. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of this process.
491-2	**Comment:** *I am very concerned about the reduction of ATV trails under this proposal. I understand that there may be some sound reasons to relocate some trails. The key is to restore what was lost and to take steps to increase trail mails available to motorized users. ATV growth and use to conduct "motorized hiking" has grown quicker than what you have been able to respond to. There are funds available for ATV users to pay their own way to do this. I would also like to see single track motorcycle trails included in your future development.* **Response:** Our decision increases ATV trails from 381 miles to 334 miles. We understand the growth in use of ATVs, but as land managers we must responsibly manage this use with minimal environmental impacts. While our decision provides for more ATV access, we understand that it may not be enough for some Forest visitors. Our process includes the provision for public involvement in our annual updates to the MVUM. The more specific you can be with your input the better we can serve your needs. Please see response to comment 428-4 for information on how ATV registration fees are used on the Forest. Please also see comment 182-2 for a discussion on motorcycles and single track trails.
491-3	**Comment:** *Dual sport motorcycling is also an important and expanding recreational opportunity. Essentially, these are street licensed motorcycles that can be used to tour primitive forest roads. They have a low impact and a very small footprint. Restricting access to two-tracks will be a big setback for those who enjoy this sport. I have a great deal of dual sport riding experience in Michigan and found that in the past the National Forests there have provided a lot of great opportunities for this sport. I am an avid participant in both silent and motorized sports and know that all can be accommodated without a lot of restrictions being put into place. I ask that the very least restrictive measures be taken that will fix any critical problems but will continue to allow motorized hikers maximum access to the forest.* **Response:** Thank you for your interest in motorcycle use on the Forest. We are not restricting street licensed motorcycle traffic to two track roads. State laws limit the use of non-registered motorcycles off of designated motorized trails. Currently we allow registered motorcycles on all Forest Service roads and motorized trails opened to the public. Motorcycles that are not registered are allowed on ATV trails only.
492-1	**Comment:** *As an extremely avid ATV enthusiast, I would like to comment on the Travel Management Project. I belong to the Kettle Morraine ATV Association, and like most clubs, families, and other individual groups, we must travel a great distance to spend a nice weekend ATVing. It has become a huge financial commitment with fuel costs. The entire ATV community in*

	Wisconsin is at the mercy of the Chequamegon National Forest, not to mention the folks in Illinois and Minnesota as well. I don't believe the ATV world would survive without it. There would be too many riders on too few trails to make it enjoyable. **Response:** Thank you for your interest in accessing the Forest with an ATV. The Chequamegon-Nicolet NF, while a large land holder within the State of Wisconsin, is not the sole provider of ATV trails and motorized family experiences. Many counties through out the State have developed motorized trails and in some cases developed campgrounds adjacent to the trails. This has alleviated some of the pressure placed upon Forest Service trails. Please see the Recreation Specialist Report for a more detailed discussion of ATV opportunities surrounding the Forest. Also, please note that in our decision we increase our miles of roads available to ATVs. We also have increased our miles of trails from 318 to 334.
492-2	**Comment:** *Club riders from out of town like to travel from place to place and back to the hotel taking a direct route or indirect route with as little back tracking as possible. For example when we stay in Ashland we ride to Valhalla (trail 63 and 31) to Port Wing (trail 40) to Iron River (trail 3) to Drummond (trail 24, 31, 7) to Delta and back to Ashland. All of the trails are excellent especially trail 24 south to Iron River. It is the Drummond to Delta that gets confusing. This year North Delta road wasn't marked for ATV use and it was extremely confusing having to right on Jannas, left on 393A, left on 393, right on 398, left on 399, left on 401, right on the unnumbered one, left on 413, then right on Halfway road. Although we are excellent about watching and staying on marked trails, it gets very difficult when they are removed year from year and are still on the map. We would greatly prefer to allow ATV access on trail 6, Horse Pasture grade and North Delta road and remove ATV use from the smaller roads? If that direct route can't be done, then Alternative 1 at least allows some options, Alternative 3 eliminates this and we simply have to back track. So please support Alternative 1.* **Response:** Thank for your comments; others expressed similar opinions regarding Alternative 1. Please see response to comment 181-3. Concerning the alternate route suggestion, this is a possibility, but will require coordination with the town as this route is within their jurisdiction. Additionally, the alternative route of Horse Pasture grade and North Delta Road are also town roads and we have no jurisdiction to change the motorized use designation. We suggest you contact the town.
492-3	**Comment:** *We really like to go from city to city or place to place whether it be for rest, food, drinks, or the bathroom. Roads that are open to ATVs that do not go anywhere may look great for mileage number statistics, but if they go nowhere, it serves only a minor purpose of those who live there. For me and other club riders, we feel that it is better to add trail or road access that allows you to ride to a specific place, or travel a loop, and if financial restrictions force the removal of some roads, please consider those that serves the least purpose.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your ATV experiences. Trail loops and routes to specific destinations were considered under the public values in the road analysis. Many of the roads that connect towns and businesses near the Forest are under the jurisdiction of the towns even though they often times carry a Forest Service road number. It would be up to each individual town to allow ATV access on these roads. Designating new access to routes and trails to help develop destinations areas that would be popular with users and compatible with the surrounding environment is a possibility, but would require the cooperation of the towns. We encourage you to stay engaged and to contact the local District Ranger for a discussion on the areas that are

	important to you.
493-1	**Comment:** *We are writing in support of the proposal to reduce motorized vehicle traffic on national forest roads. We need long term planning and preservation of the forest for future generations. We do not want short term catering to groups who want motorized "fun" at the expense of forest preservation. One has only to look at the damage to the environment caused by motorized vehicles to realize that steps have to be taken to reduce access to environmentally sensitive areas. Certainly our national forest here in northern Wisconsin is one of these areas. We have walked the Iron Horse ATV trail outside of Hurley and seen the damage caused by rogue riders. Unfortunately, there are always riders who will not stay on the trails and who engage in the "mud culture" that is promoted by ATV manufacturers and ATV magazines. Resources are not available to patrol the trail at the intensity required to prevent damage. Thank you for having the courage to propose trail closures to motorized vehicles and preserve forest ecology and solitude.* **Response:** Thank you for your input and comments. Others had similar comments; please see response to comment 185-1.
494-1	**Comment:** *I own a cabin and 40 acres at fire number 3130 Forest Service Road 2176 along with 5 other owners. It is located in the town of Phelps, Wis. We bought this cabin in 1974. I have been hunting and fishing this area for 35 years and my son for 11 years and hope we can enjoy it for many more years. I'm 48 years old and I had 2 hip replacements and by blocking those roads it will make it difficult to enjoy it as I do with my son and family. My family and I use these roads to get to our deer stands and have met many other hunters and fishermen on them. We enjoy taking rides in the Nicolet National Forest to see the wildlife and the beautiful land. The list of roads that concern us are: Spec. roads: 2234, 2555, 2165, and 2463. Secondary roads and grades: 605376, 605358, 605353, 605350, 605342, 605348, and 605383.* **Response:** Thank you for your road-specific comment. All of the roads that you have listed are part of the Fishel Timber Sale project. The Roads Analysis for the Fishel project was completed in FY 2006. FR 2234, FR 2555, FR 2165, and FR 2463 were identified to remain open, but the other roads that you have listed were all identified to be closed. Under this project, past decisions, from other site specific projects (Fishel is one example), would not be re-evaluated. Please contact the Eagle River/Florence Ranger District for more specifics.
495-1	**Comment:** *Due to the fact that many County Boards don't meet until August 19, 2008, and the deadline for comments on the Travel Management Project is August 18, 2008, our County Board and many others I talked to would like an extension of the comment period of at least thirty days, sixty days would be better.* **Response:** By regulation the comment period could not be extended beyond the 30 days, which ended August 18, 2008. However, we did accept and consider all comments received prior to making the final decision. It is important to note that the decision includes an adaptive management process such that we will continue to accept comments on a continual basis. This will include accepting roads to evaluate for inclusion or deletion from the map. We continue to assure the public this is an on-going process and that the August 18, 2008, deadline does not mean the Forest will cease taking comments. We are committed to continuing to work collaboratively with all interested parties and encourage people to be as specific as possible when commenting

	and to recognize the map will be updated annually to incorporate comments received.
495-2	**Comment:** *I have many concerns and they are also the concerns of all the Forest County Board members. Why would anyone want to close any of these roads to the public? The counties sold this land to the US Forest Service many years ago with the agreement that the land would be harvested according to good Forestry Management practices and sustain the communities with and employment for our mills, etc. At the present time our mills are closing and laying off their employees or cutting back on their operations because of lack of timber, all caused by a lack of cutting on US Forest Lands. (Why are the environmentalists controlling our Forest Lands?) Our economy is really hurting because of this non-logging stance you are taking. Forest County has over 52% of our land base in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest so you can see how this hurts us financially. The Wisconsin County Forests are producing triple the income of the Federal Forest. Is it time for the counties to take over the National Forest?* **Response:** It is true that the amount of timber harvesting on the Forest has declined over time. Timber harvesting is directly tied to the environmental analysis (NEPA) process for timber projects. Recent appeals and litigation of project decisions has reduced the amount of timber available to be sold. We understand the direct impact the sale of timber has on the local economy and payments to counties. We will continue to work with Forest and other counties through the process. Your direct involvement continues to be important. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
495-3	**Comment:** *The other agreement to the counties when the US Forest Service acquired these lands was that they would be used for recreation. We have begged for years for more trails for snowmobiles and now ATVs, all on deaf ears. Now you are proposing closing approximately half of the existing roads and trails. Whether these are logging trails or gravel roads they are all important to be open to the public, if it's for berry picking, hunting, fishing, or wildlife viewing on the poorer roads and snowmobiling and ATVing on the better trails. Let's not forget these agreements that are in place on these lands since they were transferred to you. We favor no closure of any roads. Since the no-logging stance was taken, do you have too many employees who need projects to work on that brings about these new proposals such as the Travel Management Project EA? If so, our County Board would appreciate it if these employees would once again grab the marking paint and set up hardwood logging sales and leave our trails all open to the public.* **Response:** We understand the importance of these Forest lands to the counties. It is important we continue to work together to find resolution to the issues that surround active management of the CNNF. Management of the National Forest is governed by many laws and regulations which can be challenging and confusing to understand. Many of these laws have come into place since these lands were acquired by the Federal Government. Access to the Forest is important for communities. We want to ensure we provide a good balance of roads and trails that we can maintain for your use and enjoyment.
495-4	**Comment:** *County Resolution - see letter #504, comments 3-10.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your resolution. Please see response to comments 504-3–10.

496-1	**Comment:** *As a district director of the Wisconsin Wildlife Federation, I represent a dozen "hook-&-bullet clubs" in the Central Wisconsin area. The average size of each club averages in the 75 to 100 member range. Many of our members either own properties up north or travel north to enjoy a Wisconsin's wide range of outdoors activities. Implementation of this plan would negatively impact many of these folks.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing with us how your organization is structured. We hope your members have been aware of our project and decision and have contacted us with specific suggestions as to which roads and trails they would like to see available for motor vehicle use. If this is not the case, your members will continue to have opportunities to suggest specific roads and trails to us for future map updates. We strive to provide the access people desire to facilitate their enjoyment of the National Forest while also minimizing the environmental impacts that could result from that use.
496-2	**Comment:** *Our members ask that you make available sufficient time for more public input both at the local and statewide levels. This will allow all stakeholders to weigh in on a wide range of issues relating to these road closings. Hopefully, all parties will then have a better understanding of the need (if any) for the closings. We may even see a better overall plan as the result of this additional input. I picked up on a radio report from the current Natural Resources Board Meeting this morning. The radio response didn't have any real meat for discussion other than to say that time for pubic input is winding down. This whole subject deserves a hard look and a better review. I'm hopeful that you can carry through and allow for better public input.* **Response:** We appreciate your suggestion to gather more input before we designate a network of roads and trails for public motor vehicle use. After nearly 2 years of public outreach, we believe that we have enough information to publish the first MVUM. However, we will continually accept road suggestions from people who would like to see additional roads added to the MVUM. This will be a critical component on how we update the MVUM every year. Our first update is scheduled for March 2010.
497-1	**Comment:** *I am writing to you to express my support for the proposed road closures in the Chequamegon-Nicolet Forest. In this day and age, it has become more important than ever, to do all we can to protect as much of our natural environment as possible. As stewards of our natural resources, we nave not been doing a very good job. Aldo Leopold said: "We abuse land because we regard it as a commodity belonging to us. When we see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect." Public sentiment toward protection of our natural resources is growing. The public outcry against the proposed ATV trails in the Northern Highlands-American Legion State Forest resulted in the Natural Resources Board soundly rejecting those trails.* **Response:** Thank you for your input and comments. Others had similar comments; please see response to comment 185-1.
498-1	**Comment:** *I am writing to ask that the US Forest Service does not close the roads in the National Forest in the Chequamegon-Nicolet until you have more feedback from the sportsmen or if you would please temporarily implement Alternative 1, the "no action alternative".* **Response:** We appreciate your suggestion to gather more input before we designate a network of roads and trails for public motor vehicle use. After nearly 2 years of public outreach, we believe that we have enough information to publish the first MVUM.

	However, we will continually accept road suggestions from people who would like to see additional roads added to the MVUM. This will be a critical component on how we update the MVUM every year. Our first update is scheduled for March 2010.
499-1	**Comment:** *I am writing in support of the plan to reduce motor vehicle access on the Forest. Footpaths give every able person access to the Forest with minimal adverse impact on the Forest ecosystem. Motor vehicles, on the other hand, consume finite resources, pollute the air and water, disturb the peace with their noise, adversely alter the landscape with their physical impact and deny their operators the opportunity to get some healthy fresh air and exercise. Thank you for your initiative in limiting motor vehicle use in the Forest. The benefits of your action will be appreciated by many future generations.* **Response:** We appreciate your review of our proposal. Please see response to comment 185-1 for a discussion of our decision.
500-1	**Comment:** *Question/suggestion: That the system, once the proposal is implemented, allows a level of flexibility for managers to make some amount of adjustment to the proposed routes/designations without major public involvement and expense for each route in question.* **Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. Our decision includes an adaptive management process that will provide a flexible way for the public to submit comments. The process also provides a streamlined process for us to consider and analyze the suggested roads for inclusion or deletions from the MVUM. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for an explanation of this process.
501-1	**Comment:** *I support Alternative 3 for the following reasons: I believe this is a more restrictive level of management that provides the best balance of recreational and travel uses in the forest. I am pleased to see the comprehensive planning approach that appears to have involved appropriate input. I believe this was a practical approach that considered: 1. appropriate use and impact criteria, 2. current usage, and 3. input from a range of users and public land managers. My hope is that the use designation is a management tool that gives forest resource managers a better handle on road and trail management and resource impacts into the future.* **Response:** Thank you for reviewing the EA and for your input. Many people commented with similar input. Please see response to comment 185-1 for a more detailed response.
501-2	**Comment:** *Question/suggestion: That the system, once the proposal is implemented, allows a level of flexibility for managers to make some amount of adjustment to the proposed routes/designations without major public involvement and expense for each route in question.* **Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. Our decision includes an adaptive management process that will provide a flexible way for the public to submit comments. The process also provides a streamlined process for us to consider and analyze the suggested roads for inclusion or deletions from the MVUM. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for an explanation of this process.

502-1	**Comment:** *I do not agree with Alternatives II and III concerning the Travel Management project. I do not understand why any of the proposed Marengo area trails would close. As a land owner in Chequamegon National Forest, I use these trails for hunting, ATVing, and recreational activities such as nature walks with my friends and family. For example, when my blind mother comes to visit from Florida, we take her along these trails and she loves listening to the stream. We also perused the trails to help my son rehabilitate his knee after his ACL surgery. To my knowledge, these trails have not been abused by ATVs or other such vehicles. There are plenty of non-motorized areas in the forest for those who like to hike and take nature walks such as the North Country Hiking Trail and Non-Motorized area that has trails throughout the forest.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. We understand the Marengo area is very important to you. Your use and access to the Forest is also important to us. Please see your comment 502-2 for more details.
502-2	**Comment:** *I strongly believe Alternative I is the correct course of action. Our trail system is perfect, thus adjustment is necessary. However, if for some reason Alternatives II and III are passed, I sincerely hope you leave the following Marengo trails open: 189A, W217122, 388A, W2117212, W217218, 218330, 196H, 383B, 150A, W218401, 187E, W218357, W21711, W217215, 287, 383A, 403, 150AA, 21841, W211351, W218338, W211709, W217216, W218322, 383AA, 493A, 21831, 199C, W218346, 187A, W217214, 387A, W219319, W217302, W217123, W217201, W217125, 388, 198, W217213, 1362, 874, W217401, W21512, W217202. Yes, given my comprehensive list of Marengo area trails above, I propose you leave all the Marengo trails open due to the lack of abuse and yet abundance of activities. Thank you for your consideration.* **Response:** Thank you for your road specific comment. We understand the Marengo area of the Forest is important to you. The District reviewed all of the roads that you requested to remain available to public motorized use. Upon inspection, it was found that many of these roads had not been used in a very long time. The district recommended ten of these roads remain available to pubic motorized use (Forest Roads 388, 874, 383A, 383AA, W217302, W217401, W218322, W218330, W18338, and W219319). The Travel Management Decision provides for a continual review and update of the road system. We encourage you to meet with us and together we could visit these roads and better understand your desire to continue to use them.
503-1	**Comment:** *Lake States Resource Alliance, Inc. (LSRA) submits the following comments concerning the Travel Management Plan for the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest. See included copy of our October 29, 2007 letter (listed as Comment -4 - Attachment). We did not receive a reply to this letter.* **Response:** See comment 503-4 for response.
503-2	**Comment:** *In addition to previous comments we would like to point out the following environmental concerns. Fire, with roads closed, how will the equipment get to the fire? Areas, not to mention the additional timber lost due to the time it takes to get to the fire. Contamination, disease, pollution, and moving equipment through the forest and not on roads. Thinning will become an issue with more disease. Timber sales will have added environmental problems. Ash Borer, rapidly becoming a problem moving to the area. Trees must be removed; will we build new roads to stop this invasion? Invasive plants with no roads, who will check the area and how will they be controlled.*

	Response: Thank you for your questions. Regarding your question on fire suppression: The outcome of the Travel Management Rule is a designated network of roads and trails for public motorized use. This network is only a portion of our entire transportation system. Administrative access, such as timber harvesting, fire response, etc., is not dependent on public motorized access and is outside the scope of the analysis. Please be assured that the Forest Service and other emergency agencies will have the ability to access the Forest where needed to conduct Forest management activities or emergency actions. Regarding your question on timber: The network of roads and trails designated under this project along with administrative access provides adequate and needed access for timber harvesting on the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest. This includes access to salvage insect and disease damaged trees. Please be assured that the Forest will take the appropriate action if/when the emerald ash borer arrives on the Forest. The Forest will address the need for new road construction to access timber approved for harvesting if there is inadequate access to it. This project does not eliminate the opportunity to do this. Regarding your question on invasive species: We began a program of controlling non-native invasive plants in 1997. The amount of success varies. There are areas where we have eradicated invasive plants while in other areas, depending on the species, eliminating them is not feasible and we try to prevent new infestations . Please see the NNIS Specialist Report for more information on NNIS or see the CNNF website: http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/cnnf/natres/nnis/index.html.
503-3	**Comment:** *As stated in the October 29, 2007 letter, we have real concerns. LSRA supports Alternative 1.* **Response:** Thank you for comment. Others share your opinion; please see response to comment 181-3.
503-4	**Comment:** *Letter #140, sent in during fall 2007 scoping period. All comments entered into the database on 11/29/07. This is the text of the Fall 2007 letter #140:* *1. Motorized recreation use is a legitimate activity on the National Forests. The opening remarks on two rounds of travel management open houses included positive statements from the Chief Forest Service that motorized recreation travel is a legitimate and expected use of the National Forest. In spite of this agency position statement from the Chief, the tone of both meetings suggested that restriction or elimination of motorized travel was the goal of the travel management plan. We agree with and support reasonable regulation, be they motorized, pedal powered, or oat powered. The staff of the National Forest is responsible for developing and administering recreation use. We believe that your managers need to be more proactive in promoting the opportunity to use recreational vehicles in the regulated and responsible fashion by the general public. See our comments below on coordinating motorized use with your Forest Plan.* *2. Use the Forest Plan Management Areas to identify permissive or restricted motorized recreation opportunity. Each of the Forest Plan Management Area contains a statement of the desired future condition for recreation opportunity. These are usually stated as roaded natural, or primitive or semi primitive opportunities. Management areas one through four are managed as roaded natural recreation settings, and use of ATV or other motorized recreational vehicles would be consistent with the management objectives of these areas. Management areas with a semi primitive, or wilderness objective, or non-motorized objective represent the area of greatest public conflict when motorized incursions occur. We suggest that these are the area that*

	your managers need to focus on presenting social conflicts. One way to accomplish this is to permit public use of ATV vehicles on non-paved forest roads open to public use in Management areas 1 through 4. This approach would demonstrate a much more pro-active support of motorized recreation use while preventing user conflicts in the more sensitive parts of the forest. It would also simplify your mapping process and increase public understanding of the spectrum of recreation activity you are promoting on the National Forests. Your present position is perceived as saying that you support motorized recreation, but you are in effect prohibiting motorized use by failing to specifically identify places where motorized recreation is supported and encouraged. We suggest that you demonstrate support of motorized recreation by specifically identifying management areas where the motorized use is supported and encouraged. Doing this by Forest Plan Management area brings travel management into part of the overall management for a National Forest covered by one management plan. *3. Provide for exceptional situations through a written permit process. State Law permits recreational hunting from a vehicle for handicapped persons. This policy could also apply to an ATV vehicle, or an ATV vehicle permitted in some off road situations. Firewood gathering is often times as much a recreation activity as it is a subsistence activity. An ATV can be an effective "skidding" machine. These and other unforeseen situations represent legitimate recreational uses of motorized vehicles. District Rangers should be authorized to permit such exceptions to the "no off road use" policy. The public should understand that exceptions could be granted in specific situations by application for written permit, analysis of the specific situation, and issuance of an appropriate permit such as firewood cutting permit or a special use permit. Providing for exceptions also demonstrates the agency commitment to support and manage for a legitimate motorized recreation use on the National Forests.* *4. On the ground marking. Final implementation of the travel management plan should include an on the ground marking system. The amount of data and different classes of roads that you show on your maps is too confusing for the average public reader to be able to tell when a road becomes a snowmobile trail, or then changes back to a road. The public will generally comply with reasonable regulation, but if they get confused, or cannot determine what the rules are, they will ignore the whole system of regulations. We recommend a simple sign posting a route as open to public use, be it passenger car, pick up truck, 4 WD or ATV. Likewise roads closed to vehicles should be closed to all vehicles. We support road closures during periods of wet conditions, such as spring break up, but again the closure should be to all vehicles regardless of type or weight. Consistency and evenhanded treatment of all user groups will do more to gain public cooperation than a whole manual full of conflicting rules.* **Response:** Response to paragraph 1: The goal of the TMP is to develop a network of roads and trails that are available for wheeled motorized use. The MVUM is expected to change over time as we continue to implement the goals and objectives in the plan. Response to paragraph 2: The Chequamegon/Nicolet LRMP states that "trail management and accessibility should be compatible with the area recreation opportunity spectrum" (2-27). The LRMP also discusses total and open road density upper limits relative to recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS) for roads. (FEIS 3-243, 3-244; and LRMP Appendix BB) In order to respond appropriately one must distinguish the difference between roads, routes, and trails. The scope of the TMR EA is primarily roads and routes (TMR EA, pages 4–5). For the purpose of the analysis, all roaded natural remote, roaded natural and rural ROS areas were in fact considered for motorized access. Areas that were not considered for motorized access included

	semi-primitive non-motorized ROS designation; non-motorized areas designated by the 2004 LRMP and congressionally designated wilderness areas. Response to paragraph #3: We currently issue and will continue to administer disabled hunter access permits on the east side of the Forest. There may be other limited situations where special use permits may be authorized. Response to paragraph #4: As a convenience and to assist the public with knowing where they are on the ground, we will sign with a road/trail number at the major and interior intersections of designated roads and trails. ATV routes will be signed with both a number and an ATV placard. Feedback from the public will be critical as we implement the map, especially in the first year.
504-1	**Comment:** *Attached you will find a resolution drafted by Forest County Board Chair, Erhard Huettl, which outlines his opposition to the EA as drafted. This resolution was presented by the Wisconsin Counties Association (WCA) Board of Directors at our August 8, 2008 meeting by Chairman Huettl. The WCA Board of Directors agreed to support Forest County in the request for an extension. WCA formally requests that you extend the comment period for the EA to allow other counties in Wisconsin to weigh in on this important topic. As most county boards meet on August 19, 2008 an extension of the deadline would allow other counties the opportunity to give this matter the time and attention it deserves.* **Response:** Regulations do not allow for an extension of the comment period (see 36 CFR 215.6). We will, however, take comments and feedback on a continual basis. Please see response to comment 182-3.
504-2	**Comment:** *Forest County has great concern over the proposed closure of 55 percent of the public roads within the CNNF. These lands provide a valuable stimulus to the local economy and Wisconsin tourism. Public access to recreational pursuits such as hunting, fishing and wildlife viewing will be severely restricted if the roads in the CNNF are closed.* **Response:** Thank you for your concerns regarding recreation and economic impact. Please see response to comment 339-4.
504-3	**Comment:** *WHEREAS, the United States Forest Service has published a Forest-wide Travel Management Plan in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest that proposes closure of 55% of the public roads within the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest, and WHEREAS, The United States Forest Service fails to recognize the need to manage the National Forests as productive managed forests and continues to regulation National Forests as though they were National Parks, which is contrary to the congressional granted to the United States Forest Service for the purchase and management of the Chequamegon-Nicolet National forest, and WHEREAS, The United States Forest Service has not managed the National Forests consistent with the provisions of the Clark-McNary Act to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of the citizens of the United States, and WHEREAS, for the most part these lands were purchased from the counties where said lands are located under the pretext and commitment that these lands would be returned to a forested condition and that these land would again provide a sound base for the local and regional economy and that local governments would play a major role in the management and operation of the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest, (also in letter 495 and 585)* **Response:** The closure of roads under the Travel Management Rule involves mostly unauthorized roads. These are roads that

	are partially, if not totally, ingrown with vegetation and where public vehicle access is already severely limited. These unauthorized roads are not needed for timber harvesting access. A network of authorized roads for administrative access will be retained for timber harvesting and new ones constructed if needed. The concerns on timber harvesting on the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest is outside the scope of this analysis. The decisions on timber harvesting are addressed in the current Forest Plan and are impacted by budgets and timber management decisions being appealed/litigated by outside individuals and interest groups.
504-4	**Comment:** *WHEREAS, The United States Forest Service has failed to consider the negative impact of reduced employment, and loss of local and state tax generation, that otherwise would be created by tourism opportunities that rely on motorized access to public lands within counties and communities where the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest is located in its recently published United States Forest Service's Travel Management Project Environmental Assessment (also in letter 495 and 585).* **Response:** Please see response to comment 332-3.
504-5	**Comment:** *WHEREAS, Lands within the National Forests should be accessible to citizens of these United States of America and not just experienced from the edges of the forest boundaries along major highways, and WHEREAS, the proposed closure of the roads in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest eliminates a reasonable level of public access to recreational pursuit including but not limited to hunting, fishing, wood cutting, mushroom and berry picking, birding, wildlife viewing, ATV and snowmobile travel, and general access by the young, elderly, physically and or mentally impaired, or provide emergency and or rescue services to visitors to the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest, and (also in letter 495 and 585).* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. We believe our decision provides a balance of motorized and non-motorized access for the activities you list. We believe our decision provides adequate access for everyone while minimizing environmental impacts. Our decision also provides for a sustainable network of roads and trails available to public motorized use. We encourage the public to continue to send us specific roads that they would like to designate for motorized use. The more specific people can be with their needs the better we can address them. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of our update process. Please see response to comment 260-1 regarding access for persons of varying abilities, and please see response to comment 404-1 regarding access for emergency services.
504-6	**Comment:** *WHEREAS, the lands within the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest boundaries are not large tracts of contiguous property such as within National Parks but include significant private property that relies upon travel upon these roads for a variety of purposes such as access to employment, their private lands, routes for emergency vehicles, and emergency evacuation routes in times of disaster, and (also in letter 495 and 585).* **Response:** Thank you for your concern. Private access to private property for owners and their guests can be secured over roads that are no longer open to the public; however, the private land owner would need to contact the Forest. Access for emergencies is not dependent on public motorized access. Please be assured that the Forest Service and other emergency agencies will have the ability to access the Forest where needed for emergency actions.

504-7	**Comment:** *WHEREAS, the proposed closure of these roads within the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest will have a negative impact on sound forestry management and will limit the United States Forest Services' ability to combat fire, disease, pests, and invasive species (also in letter 495 and 585).* **Response:** We appreciate your concerns regarding timber harvesting and fire suppression. The outcome of the Travel Management Rule is a designated network of roads and trails for public motorized use. This network is only a portion of our entire transportation system. Our transportation system also includes roads open only for Forest Service administrative access. Administrative access, such as timber harvesting, fire response, etc is not dependent on public motorized access and is outside the scope of the analysis. Please be assured that the Forest Service and other emergency agencies will have the ability to access the Forest where needed to conduct Forest management activities or emergency actions.
504-8	**Comment:** *NOW THEREFORE, IT BE RESOLVED THAT the Forest County Board of Supervisors recognize the tremendous importance of transportation networks within the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest and that the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest is an exceptional natural resource that has the capacity to provide recreation, social and economic benefits on a sustainable basis provided that the lands within the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest remain accessible to the traveling public and local units of government, and (also in letter 495 and 585).* **Response:** Thank you for your input. The transportation network within the Forest is important and we believe our decision will provide adequate access to the traveling public. As mentioned above, we encourage the public to continue to send us specific roads that they would like to designate for motorized use. The more specific people can be with their needs the better we can address them.
504-9	**Comment:** *BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the United States Forest Service's Travel Management Project Environmental Assessment has failed to properly address forest ecology, local historic uses, multiple use principles, and social and economic needs of the region, and (also in letter 495 and 585).* **Response:** We appreciate your concern regarding forest ecology, historic uses, multiple use, and social/economic needs. Please see the EA, specialist reports, and the Roads Analysis Process report for a discussion of these topics. Please also see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
504-10	**Comment:** *BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this proposed closure of roads coupled with severe reductions in timber harvesting below sustainable levels within the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest contributes continuing evidence that the United States Forest Service is unwilling or unable to properly manage the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest and that this Board of Supervisors demands that unless the United States Forest Service provides for a Travel Management Project Environmental Assessment that addresses all of the stated above, that all land within the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest should revert back to the counties where said forest lands are located by virtue of a breach of promise by the Federal Government and their failure to comply with the Clark-McNary Act (also in letter 495 and 585).* **Response:** We take our responsibilities to manage the CNNF very seriously and are dedicated to managing these lands in

	accordance with the laws and regulations that have been established for such, including the Clark-McNary Act and the subsequent National Forest Management Act. The counties have a vested interest in how the National Forests are managed. We respect and are committed to that interest. We believe the decision for this project addresses the concerns the counties have to ensure access for recreational pursuits of Forest users. This decision will not affect our ability to manage the Forest in accordance with the Forest Plan.
505-1	**Comment:** *My family owns a cottage in the Nicolet Forest area. My whole life, my family and I have gone to our cottage to participate in activities using the roads you are planning to close (activities such as snowmobiling, motorcycling, cross country skiing, and observing the wildlife). I am now turning fifteen. My father has been going up his whole life with his parents. My father is turning 50. My grandparents also have a cottage in the area. My grandpa is now turning 74. All of us use the roads you are planning on closing to motorized activities. I feel that if you decide to close these roads, you'd be making a mistake. These roads and the wood around them hold such great beauty and a sense of the wild. People who come from the city won't be able to appreciate that if you close these roads. By closing these roads, you'd be taking something from the human race. I, and other humans, greatly enjoy the fact that when driving down a road, you can see animals in their natural habitat. We love seeing the colors of fall, the stillness of winter, and the new life of spring. The human race needs to see animals in their natural habitat, not in a cage. Let people see the beauty of Northern Wisconsin. I would like to see the Alt. 1 plan or the Alt. 3 plan put into action. I hope you take my letter into consideration when deciding.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your family's experiences on the Forest. It is important to us that you continue your family's heritage of visiting the Forest. This project and our decision only affect wheeled motorized access to the Forest. All other roads will still be available for your non-motorized uses. Our decision also provides a process for you to provide specific roads for consideration in our annual updates to our motor vehicle use map. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
506-1	**Comment:** *In reviewing your present and proposed forest road closures, I would offer the following specific roads that you may wish to reconsider. These first four serve as access to lakes within this ranger district that have remote or dispersed campsites developed by the national Forest Service. I believe they have current signage, fire rings, picnic tables, and usually wilderness toilets. I have witnessed all of these being used over the last several years and it would be al loss to discourage that use by closing the vehicle access to (or near to) all of them. Bose Lake is accessed by forest road 6133113. This road also has a fire number on it as there is private land beyond the campsite. Harriet Lake is accessed by forest road 613364. Luna Lake - North sites are accessed by forest road 613395. Bastille Lake - 4 miles SW of Long Lake is accessed by forest roads 2241 and 719493. My wife and I enjoy being able to both visit these lakes as well as explore other less traveled roads and trails. As we get older, being able to drive in a ways permits us to access areas that we may not be able to if it was all by foot. Some of the roads we walk may not be walkable if not for a prior hunter, fisherman or firewood gatherer, that trimmed out prior blow downs.* **Response:** Thank you for identifying these important dispersed sites. Roads 6133113 and 613364 were reviewed and added to the selected alternative. Road 613395, which accesses Luna Lake, was also reviewed and determined to be closed because of the existing campground on the south side of Luna Lake. I believe your reference to 719493 is incorrect and should have been

	719497, which accesses Bastile Lake. Both of these roads have been analyzed under a separate site-specific project called Long Rail. The Long Rail Roads Analysis was completed in 2005. Road 719497 was recommended to remain open and Road 719493 was recommended to remain closed. Under this Travel Management Project previous site-specific decisions were not re-analyzed and those decisions remain.
506-2	**Comment:** *In fall we both deer hunt and cut firewood (on a National Forest Service permit). We do both on the land across highway 55 from my "40" and hunting shack. If we are fortunate enough to harvest a deer, we will often use forest service road 2278 and 712326 to remove it from the woods. This 712326 seldom gets enough use to even great through the decaying leaf cover. If you are open to individual requests we would appreciate being able to continue using that road. Few others use it since it doesn't have a significant destination.* **Response:** Thank you for submitting road specifics. FR 2278 and 712326 are part of the Long Rail Project. The Roads Analysis for this project was completed in 2005. Both of these roads have been identified for open public use in the Long Rail decision.
506-3	**Comment:** *In a related manner (but not part of this project), my 40 acres, behind Fire #14253, approximately 2 miles south of the Pine River bridge, are incorrectly shaded on your National Forest Map (the one sold from ranger stations) as State Owned land. This land has been in our family for 55 years. I've mentioned that each year at the Eagle River ranger station, when I buy a wood gathering permit, but if you could also put it in your tickler file of corrections for the next printing of the map, that would be appreciated.* **Response:** Thank you for this valuable information; we have provided it to our mapping personnel for updating our data. There is an enormous amount of data in our mapping data bases to manage and confirm. This is an enormous task. Accurate information is always appreciated.
506-4	**Comment:** *I have seen very little overuse, abuse or environmental effects which this proposed action seems to be focused on, based on the Environmental Assessment. I suspect this is a relatively lightly used section of the Nicolet that may be able to sustain a greater level of accessibility than more populated areas. If less of these roads are available the hunting or fishing activity will either be more concentrated in remaining accessible areas or reduced altogether. I don't believe either of these outcomes would be good for the public, the economy, or even the forest.* **Response:** Thank you for your input. Others share your concerns. Please see response to comment 217-1 regarding concentrating hunting. Please also see response to comment 332-3 regarding economic impact.
506-5	**Comment:** *Vicinity map showing lakes of dispersed sites.* **Response:** This is very helpful. Thank you.
507-1	**Comment:** *All 4657 miles of roads need to be left open! If you close many of the roads as proposed thousands of acres of forest will never be used by anyone, this will be a total waste of the national forest. If you are not going to have road access to the*

	national forest (public land) you may as well sell it, then at least a few people will have a chance to use it. If it is public land let the public use it. You should be looking at ways of opening up more roads so there can be more public access, not restricting use. **Response:** Thank you for providing this comment. There are a total of approximately 9,200 miles of roads accessing the Forest. While approximately 4,600 miles of roads are under our jurisdiction, the remaining roads are under the jurisdiction of the towns, counties, and the State. The 4,657 miles you are referring to are only those roads under our jurisdiction. This project affects only these roads. The remaining roads will still be accessible just as they are today. With our decision, there will be approximately 6,800 miles of roads available for motorized access to the Forest. Please see comment 181-3 for a discussion on our decision.
508-1	**Comment:** *I find it appalling and disgraceful for our government agencies to tell us that we can not use the forest. This is the worst and dumbest plan that I have seen come out of the Forest Service in 45 years of existence on this planet. You people should be ashamed of the way that you are managing our resources. This is just another case of environmental Nazis once again getting their way when they do not even use these resources. Why are the wolves allowed access and people are not? Are they more important than people? I will stop now just because I could rant all day about how socialism and communism are the guiding forces of how the forest service works today.* **Response:** Thank you for your input. Please see comment 181-3 for a discussion of why we are implementing this project and for a discussion of our decision. Please also see our Decision Notice for more details. Additionally, please note that wolves were not the reason for any roads being unavailable for motorized use. While one of the outcomes of this project would be a reduction in the number of miles of open roads within wolf pack territories, it is not one of the purposes of this project. Wildlife was used as one of the resource risks in the roads analysis along with public values. Wolves were a sub-category in wildlife and were always assessed low risk.
509-1	**Comment:** *I would like to comment on the proposed changes to Chequamegon-Nicolet NF Travel Management Project. I live in the Great Divide Ranger District on Beaver Dam Lake and the Brunsweiler River. I know of two forest roads that have been abused: Forest Roads 187A and 189A. These roads are off of Mineral Lake Road and Spring Brook Road. I have witnessed on several occasions subjects riding ATVs and snowmobiles far past where these roads allow. When re-posted this past fall, the postings remained for only a few days. The violators do not stop at this point, and will ride through the river to access areas that are not open to any form of motor vehicle. The use of ATVs and motorized vehicles have caused marked deterioration to the ground cover and there is extensive soil erosion. I have walked these areas and have picked up various types of litter. I would like to see these roads restricted to foot traffic only as described in Alternative 2. This Alternative 2 would also allow for easier patrolling of these areas and prevention of further deterioration and noted violations.* **Response:** Thank you for your road specific comments. We received several requests to keep these roads open. Upon field inspection, we agree with you that these roads should remain unavailable to motorized use. FR 187A is shown as non-motorized use on the decision map; it is in a Research Natural Area and also intersects with the North Country National Scenic Trail. FR 189A is an error on the newly released map and should be unavailable to motorized use. It is shown on the map as “Fall highway legal only”. We are currently working to resolve the discrepancy.

510-1	**Comment:** *Mike is concerned about ATV access.* **Response:** I explained the context of the 55% of roads closing (FS jurisdiction is a portion of the roads accessing the Forest). I also explained that ATV trail availability is unchanged and ATV routes are mostly unchanged in our proposal. When asked how to increase ATV trails I explained that our Forest Plan does allow for an increase, but TMR did not address an increase in ATV trails. I told him that ATV trails will be addressed at the District level in site-specific projects and suggested that he get involved with local ATV groups and work with the Districts. Please note that in our decision the miles of roads available to ATVs had increased by 71 miles to 559 miles of roads. The miles of trails available to ATVs have increased from 318 to 334.
511-1	**Comment:** *Terry is a bear hunter and hunts in the Shanagolden/Chippewa township areas. Terry inquired about TMR and our alternatives. Wanted to know what's being closed* **Response:** TMR and the Forest's implementation of the rule was explained; also explained were the maps (including their differences), and how to comment. He requested maps of the Shanagolden and Chippewa township areas. These maps were provided.
512-1	**Comment:** *Bill submitted a comment last year asking for the following road numbers to be closed: 51425, 51426, 51427, 51428. These roads do not display on the Alt 2 maps, but they display on the Alt 3 maps as open to HLV and ATV. He is again commenting that he would like these roads closed. He uses this area of the Forest for hunting and prefers a non-motorized hunting experience.* **Response:** Thank you for your road-specific comment. This is the best way for us to address your needs. We re-evaluated this area and in our decision, Road 51425 will remain open to HLVs year round while the other three roads (51426, 51427, 51428) will be unavailable to public motorized use. This entire area is one of the wetter locations on the District, so the roads selected to be open were done according to their landscape condition (high ground) and current condition. The District left roads open to provide a through-road as a loop for a motorized hunting/recreational opportunity.
513-1	**Comment:** *Cathy is concerned about hunters with guns being in the woods and the safety of non-hunters being unaware of hunting seasons. Cathy believes the Forest Service should be posting the hunting seasons for public safety. If we are advocating and inviting visitors to the Forest, we need to forewarn them about the potential for guns in the woods. She is concerned about closing roads because she wants the hunters to stay back in the woods.* **Response:** Thank you for your concern about hunting safety. Hunter safety programs are outside the scope of TMR.
513-2	**Comment:** *Cathy is a real estate agent in the Cable area and is also concerned about the economic impact and property values if ATV access is reduced.* **Response:** We appreciate your concern. Please note that in our decision, on the Chequamegon side of the Forest, the roads designated for ATV use are relatively unchanged and were put in place as a result of implementing our 2004 Forest Plan. The number of miles of trails available to ATVs has increased from 318 to 334. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed

	discussion on the economic issue.
514-1	**Comment:** *George is a property owner near Lake 3 and Marengo. He is concerned with ATV closures. Supports Alt 1 for no change.* **Response:** Thank you for your input. Others have expressed similar concerns regarding ATV access. Please see responses to comment 513-2 regarding ATV access and comment 181-3 regarding why we are implementing this project.
515-1	**Comment:** *James is not in favor of closing any ATV trails. His son recently had a knee operation and wouldn't be able to go far enough into the Forest to hunt. I explained to James that ATV trails on the Forest will remain unchanged and the ATV routes will be mostly unchanged.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Please see response 513-2 regarding ATV access. Please also see comments 501-1 and 501-2 for responses to your road specific suggestions.
516-1	**Comment:** *Matt is concerned about fires and would like to see fire roads at every section boundary. He recommends that as many roads as possible be kept open and covered with wood chips to soak up fuel to prevent fires. This would make properties more valuable and would aid in the enjoyment, employment and tourism of the area. Silence should be at 0 decibels for any and all people to enjoy properties.* **Response:** Thank you for your concern about wildfires. Please see response to comment 401-1 regarding administrative access to the Forest.
517-1	**Comment:** *The Bayfield County Tourism & Recreation Committee supports Alternative 1 of the CNNF Travel Management Project. Bayfield County is the second largest county in Wisconsin and nearly half of our land is in public ownership. Our natural resources are the basis for our two main industries, timber and tourism. We feel that as much public land as possible needs to be accessible to the public for hunting, fishing and recreation since these are the activities upon which our economy relies.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment regarding access and tourism. Please see response to comment 181-3 for a discussion on why we are implanting this project. Please see response to comment 332-3 regarding economics. We believe our decision provides for a balance of motorized and non-motorized access to the Forest.
517-2	**Comment:** *If the amount of closure that is being discussed takes place, our fear is that the public perception will change dramatically and that people will no longer come to this area which is known for its accessibility to public lands. A decrease in travel to our area would cause our businesses to suffer and possibly not be able to continue to operate.* **Response:** Thank you for your concern regarding businesses. Please see response to comment 332-3.
517-3	**Comment:** *If the Forest decides to select an action alternative, we would prefer that it be Option 3, which already incorporates some of the public comments that have been submitted. We would also hope that you would consider additional comments prior*

	to finalizing your plan. Thank you for considering our comments. **Response:** Thank you for your comment and input. We considered all of the comments submitted during our 30-day comment period and evaluated or re-evaluated any road specific comment in our decision. Our decision included an additional 205 miles of roads and 16 miles of ATV trails in our designated network of roads and trails for motorized use. Additionally, our decision includes an adaptive management process whereby we will continue to accept road-specific comments for addition or removal from the MVUM. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for specific information on how this adaptive management process will work.
518-1	**Comment:** *Would like to have FR 2137 (north of Reisner Lake) closed.* **Response:** Thank you for your road specific comment. In our decision this road will remain available to HLVs. We have recently closed other roads in the area. This road is needed for access to this area.
519-1	**Comment:** *FR718: This road is identified as open to HLV's only under Alts 2 and 3. It is signed as open to ATVs now, and is used heavily by bear hunters. He feels it should be open to both HLV's and ATV's, as historically has received both types of use.* **Response:** Thank you for your road specific comments. FR 718 designated use was reviewed and changed to HLV, ATV in the selected alternative, thereby increasing motorized use opportunities.
519-2	**Comment:** *FR750: This road is identified as open to HLV's under Alts 2 and 3. Much of this road is not drivable, because of logging slash left behind after a past clearcut. He feels it shouldn't show up on the map as being open to HLV's if it isn't drivable on the ground.* **Response:** Following field verification of the road condition by District personnel, FR 750 designated use was reviewed and changed to HLV, ATV in the selected alternative, thereby increasing motorized use opportunities.
519-3	**Comment:** *FR 302: This road shows up as open to HLV's under Alts 2 and 3. He feels this road should not be open to vehicles because people have been creating big messes in the gravel pit at the end of the road. Large items like furniture have been deposited and partially burned back there. He and his friends have found a lot of broken glass, furniture, target practice debris, and other garbage- partially burned at the end of the road on many occasions. He doesn't know who the perpetrators are.* **Response:** FR 302 designated use was reviewed and remains as HLV in the selected alternative due to an aggregate high level of resource risks associated with the road.
519-4	**Comment:** *FR 1630: This road appears to be completely on private property. It shows up on all the maps as open to HLV's (first part) and as "other public road" (last 2/3's of it). It isn't highlighted on the maps. He has permission from the private landowner to use this mostly private road to access an area he and his family and friends deer hunt in. He doesn't want to lose that access due to any closures the FS might impose.*

	Response: FR 1630 is a town road. For this reason it is outside the scope of the TMR project and was not considered for designated motorized use. FR 1630 is considered an open public road. Local Township officials have the authority to designate ATV use on these roads.
520-1	**Comment:** *I had hoped to see that the public comment correspondence from earlier in the process had been made available as part of the report. I would like to see what other people are thinking about these issues even if their views are different than mine. It seems to me that that is an important part of all the parties involved coming to some sort of an understanding over the different issues involved. Are these responses a matter of public record that we would be able to view?* **Response:** Yes, the previous comments are a matter of public record and are available for your review. Please contact Joan Marburger at 715-762-5178.
520-2	**Comment:** *I would like to state some of the ways in which my family and friends have shared in the use of the CNNF so you can understand my perspective. I have hunted, fished, photographed, and explored (by car, truck, boat, ATV, snowmobile, and walking) woods, roads, trails, swamps, rivers, and lakes. Last year, my youngest son and I saw, and took video and pictures, of Elk on County GG. I have seen fisher, deer, bear, flying squirrels, and a wolf along with many other animals and birds. I have treated the forest as my own with respect for the precious resource that it is. I have taught my children to have that same respect for the land. We have picked up and carried out garbage that we have found in the woods or along the road.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing with us how you and your family use this very special part of northern Wisconsin. And thank you for being good stewards.
520-3	**Comment:** *I understand that recreation needs to be managed to some degree for everyone to share in the wealth of the forest. To what degree it will be managed becomes one of the real issues affecting us all. But I have a great concern that vast amounts of it will become inaccessible for all practical purposes. I see that according to the EA, that concern is warranted as it is listed as a "Significant Issue: Not Enough Motorized Access" on page 7 of the EA.* **Response:** Thank you for taking the time to share your perspective. Many people expressed similar comments. Each of the alternatives reflects a compromise between recreational use and resource protection. We believe our decision provides for a balance of all types of access for all Forest users, both motorized and non-motorized. The selected alternative further addressed the significant issue of 'Not Enough Motorized Access' by adding 205 miles of roads and 16 miles of ATV trails to the designated network. Please see response to comment 181-3 for a discussion of why we are implementing this project and how we will continue to update our map.
520-4	**Comment:** *It seems to me that the terms "environmental impact" or "resource damage" (or the potential for resource damage; page 16) can be rather subjective, or a matter of opinion. If a deer feeds on young trees, or makes trails in the woods because it feeds in the same area, and follows the same path, does it cause "damage" or "impact"? Would we agree that some levels of damage or impact are acceptable, albeit natural, and that the forest could survive and even thrive? I'm sensitive to this issue as being in a family that enjoys riding ATVs in the wilderness (on trails where you can explore so much more area than walking*

	alone can), some people say ATVs shouldn't be allowed in the forest because of the damage they do. Is that the reason they are not allowed on the East side of the forest? I believe that on a proper trail system, this damage is minimal, acceptable. **Response:** We recognize that OHVs, including ATVs, are a legitimate use of the Forest. We believe our decision provides for a sustainable and accessible designated network of roads and trails for public motorized use. Our decision provides for an additional 71 miles of roads available for ATV use on the east side of the Forest and an additional 16 miles of ATV trails on the west side of the Forest. Additionally, our decision includes an adaptive management process whereby we will continue to accept road-specific comments for addition or removal from the MVUM. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for specific information on how this adaptive management process will work.
520-5	**Comment:** *The apparent trend of shutting down vast areas of the forest to practical access concerns me greatly. I know, I "can walk". And I have, for miles, carrying many pounds of equipment to hunt. But what about older people, or handicapped people that are not able to do that? Are we going to discriminate against them? I have driven my truck 100+ miles from my house to get to the forest. It would not be practical to walk that far. Nor would it be practical to walk the 15+ miles on gravel roads to get to another area of the forest on gravel roads. Nor would it be practical to walk in 5+ miles on Trail #5 (I take my ATV, and these are the types of roads that are being closed). Then I hiked in about a half-mile. Now we are at the quiet place that I got my 10 point buck several years ago. All these ML- rated roads serve a purpose and are a necessary part of the network of roads. Without them practical access to the forest is lost. What becomes the value of the forest if we cannot use and enjoy it? Where has our "high-quality recreation experience" (page 2, strategic plan) gone? If you alienate the public using the forest, I believe it will have a detrimental effect, people will eventually say "Let's just sell it off, we can't use it anyway. Might just as well save on our taxes, cut the budgets."* **Response:** We welcome people of all abilities to the Forest. We believe our decision provides adequate access for all. Please see response to comment 260-1.
520-6	**Comment:** *I was confused about the statement that there were more than 500 miles of ATV trails listed in the counties on the east side of the forest (page 12, bottom). But in the sentence previous, it states there are only .83 miles of roads open to ATVs. It appears that the 500 miles and the 700 miles stated in the section preceeding it are not on CNNF property. If so, that seems somewhat irrelevant as I thought the issues covered in the EA were about access to the forest, not private, county, or state land. It appears to me that access on the east side is quite restricted, and access on the west side will be greatly diminished. I was also concerned about trails being developed as funds allow, and the seemingly large number of projects on hold (page 11). It seems like that is a polite way of saying after shutting so many trails down, new opprtunities may be few and far between.* **Response:** You are correct; the 700 miles mentioned relates to the cumulative motorized recreation opportunities available on other Federal; state; county; township, other governmental and private lands. We are required to analyze cumulative effects to National Forest system lands by CEQ regulations. Our decision includes a process to continually accept and consider specific road suggestions from the public. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice. We also will continue site-specific projects on the Ranger Districts for adding additional ATV roads and trails to our designated network. Please see page 4 of the Decision

	Notice. We encourage you to stay engaged. The more specific you can be about your access needs the better we can address them.
521-1	**Comment:** *I'm very much against the road closures in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest. I thought the US in forest service stands for us not a select few who think they own the forest. It seems the people that are for the Travel Management Plan don't use the forest anyway. We are hunters, ATV riders, bough cutters, and just people that enjoy the outdoors. We have 2 boys and they have been in the woods since they where 6 months old. (hunting, ATVing, and just enjoying the woods with us) Maybe we can take the woods away from them and they can sit in front of the T.V. or Playstations.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Others expressed the same opinions. Please see comment 181-3 for a discussion why we are implementing this project.
521-2	**Comment:** *Did anyone really study this plan. I noticed you have road closures to peoples private land. Let me guess? they own helicopters to fly into them. One example is road 1233 and 865a. These are just a few examples. You also have roads open to vehicle and ATV traffic like 1331 and 176D which have been burmed up for at least 10 years. There are 100's of roads that are not on the travel management plan map (1, 2 or 3) you could at least update the map so they are accurate. Does the person who came up with these maps have a clue as to what is really in our forest. It seems I can do a better job, maybe because I actually spend time in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest.* **Response:** We appreciate your comment. FR 1233 does not lead to any private land within the National Forest. FR 865A does in fact provide access to private land, and will have no change in designated use on the final motorized vehicle use map (MVUM). FR 1331 is designated for HLV from FR 338 to a stream crossing at mile post 1.15. If FR 1331 is in fact closed as the commenter suggests; the Forest will make the correction in the inventory. FR176D was confirmed open and drivable by 4-wheel drive during field recon for the Twin Ghost project. Please also note that private access to private property for owners and their guests can be secured over roads that are no longer open to the public. The private landowner would need to contact the Forest for a special use permit.
521-3	**Comment:** *If you do close these roads what is left for the people in the northwoods to do? Did you consider what closing the forest down will do the economy in the area. Not only for recreation but for the logging industy (which is 75% of the northland.)* **Response:** Thank you for your concerns regarding the economic impacts to the area. Please see responses to comments 232-3 and 332-3.
522-1	**Comment:** *Our Associations mutually oppose the closure of forest roads for the following reasons: 1. This proposal closes public access to public lands paid for by taxpayers who will be denied access to their land. 2. This proposal will close off thousands of acres to use for hunters and other outdoor enthusiasts and is a potential violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act. 3. It is unrealistic expect a hunter to haul a deer or bear several miles by hand necessitated by closing these primitive road. 4. Limiting access to hunters has a negative effect on the local and state economy. 5. Limiting access to recreational use has a negative effect on the local and state economy. 6. Closing off primitive roads reduces fire fighting effectiveness. 7. Current*

	harvest levels in Wisconsin National Forests are grossly below sustainable production levels. Eliminating roads exacerbates the ability to meet minimum harvest potential. 8. Declining access exacerbates declining minimum sustainable forest production which has been a major factor in the closing of saw and paper mills and loss of tax revenue and jobs in the U.S. and particularly in Wisconsin. 9) The Forest Service is grossly out of step with the national search for alternate fuels. At a time when the nation is heavily investing in alternative fuels - especially cellulosic derived fuels - it is inconceivable that access to such fuels be reduced by an agency of our government. 10. The analysis for its Travel Management Plan does not include staff savings attributable to closing access to the forests. If access to half the forest is eliminated to many classes of its citizen owners, then it is reasonable to expect a savings by reducing forest service staff. 11. The likely cause for little public comment on its Transportation management plan is the error of the forest service for not speaking clearly and plainly. The descriptive phrase Travel Management Plan could be about hotel accommodations and perdiems for staff. What is at issue is access restrictions to Wisconsin's National Forests. **Response:** It is our responsibility to establish and maintain a public motor vehicle road and trail system that will accommodate legitimate uses of the Forest. These include access for hunting and many other recreational and outdoor pursuits. It is expected that many of these roads that are currently being used will be available for future use. This decision does not specifically close roads but determines which of these roads will be available for public motorized use. We will continue to evaluate these roads site specifically to determine what roads are needed for management of the Forest and when roads are important for public access. The more information we have regarding specific roads the better informed these decisions will be. We appreciate your concerns and also your feedback about our terminology, etc. We pledge to continue to engage the public in this process and welcome your feedback on how we may be more effective in these efforts.
523-1	**Comment:** *I am writing to express my displeasure with the Forest service option to close Roads ID 400,400A, 393, and 300. I support Alternative 1 No action. I support ATV use on these roads as well as HLV. Whoever wrote the comment does not seem to be familiar with the road or its usage. I live 4 miles from these roads and have for 37 years. This road is the primary road used to access this section for all types of hunting, recreation and traveling including the area referred to as "east of the berm" which is apparently the 6 inch bump 1/4 mile east of "Sandy Corners". The same is true for Road ID 393. This road is not overgrown with vegetation and we use all the time. We wonder who wrote this and how come we don't see them as we are out there every day.* **Response:** Thank you for your input and road-specific comment. Others expressed similar comments regarding the alternatives; please see response to comment 181-3 for reasons why we are implementing this project. Regarding your road suggestions: FR 400 was reviewed and designated for HLV in the selected alternative. Following is the road-specific comment provided by the District Ranger: "On August 13, 2008, I recommended to leave this road designated as is. District staff made comments that 400 East and 440A have some relic berms; however, our database still has them as open and they are utilized as open. These roads are through an RNA; however, risks that have been brought forward (NNIS) are more potential risks and in this case due to the high value > risk, I have decided to recommend continued public use to provide connector routes in the Town of Drummond. Note: This road will be a priority for the District to monitor for impacts to a research natural area (RNA). In addition, since this road does go through an RNA I recommend it be designated as HLV use only."

	FR 400A was reviewed and designated for fall access with HLV and ATV. Following is the road-specific comment provided by the District Ranger: "I made a recommendation on August 13, 2008, to leave as it is. District staff made comments that 400 East and 440A have some relic berms; however, our database still has them as open and they are utilized as open. These roads are through an RNA; however, risks that have been brought forward (NNIS) are more potential risks and in this case due to the high value > risk, I have decided to continue to leave them open to provide connector routes in the Town of Drummond". FR 393 was reviewed and designated for HLV in the selected alternative. Following is the road-specific comment provided by the District Ranger: "This road was designated closed in Alternative 3. On August 13, 2008, I made a recommendation to leave this road open as a connector road in the Town of Drummond. Although the condition of this road is marginal (overgrown), the value is high. The road is in an RNA; however, no risks have been brought forward and I decided value > risk". FR 300 is a gated road and considered outside the scope of the project. Roads closed under previous decisions were not re-evaluated as a part of this project.
524-1	**Comment:** *Perhaps the most controversial topic during long range planning on both our State Forests and County Forests has been motorized access. The Department and several of the County Forests have gone to great lengths to collaborate with user groups and try to provide for all of the different interests. We are aware it was an issue during the CNNF's 2004 Plan revision as well. The 2005 Travel Management Rule has brought access back into the spotlight on the CNNF. The Department can appreciate the public process that has been employed thus far. However, views expressed at the August Natural Resources Board meeting by a number of conservation groups including the Conservation Congress, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation, and Hunters Rights Coalition expressed concerns over the impacts of the proposed road closures. We would encourage the Forest Service to collaborate directly with these conservation groups whose constituents form the foundation for the hunting and fishing heritage in Wisconsin. The Department shares access concerns for all user groups as we manage our State lands for a wide variety of users. Management of the deer herd is an important job of the DNR and access to hunters plays a big role in managing the size of the deer herd. Deer densities are above goal in many areas of the State and are compromising the health of our forests and the ability to regenerate some species. As you consider road densities and access to the forest it is important to consider hunter access and to get feedback from the hunting community on how road closures affect them.* **Response:** We are committed to providing an appropriate balance of access for hunters and other users of the Forest. We heard from hunters who prefer non-motorized access as well as those that rely on motorized access for their hunt. We will continue to work with hunter organizations and other groups to collaboratively develop and maintain the longer-term access plans. This decision represents a point in time along the continuum of the development of the long-term access plan for wheeled motorized use. We will continue to develop this system as we gather more site-specific information about the unauthorized roads and continued implementation of the goals and objectives in the 2004 Forest Plan.
524-2	**Comment:** *The document "Travel Management Talking Points" mentions that "Most of these [unauthorized] roads are only accessible by high clearance vehicles or not accessible at all". In the EA it would have been helpful if the Forest Service had been able to extract or estimate those miles of road to provide a better picture of the true impacts to the majority of the recreating*

	public. A little more detailed look at the number of new roads / trails as they relate to proximity to special management areas, designated Old Growth, Wilderness, and non-motorized areas would have been helpful also. **Response:** We do not have a complete inventory of all of the unauthorized roads that exist on the CNNF; therefore, it is difficult to extract or estimate what the true impact of this initial decision may be. As a result we have included an adaptive management strategy that will allow us to evaluate site-specific road suggestions. In addition, we will continue our process of inventory and evaluation of all roads through site-specific analysis and decision making. These processes will include public involvement.
524-3	**Comment:** *It is our understanding that this project focuses solely on "unauthorized" roads under the sole jurisdiction of the Forest Service. Typically these are the lowest maintenance level roads under consideration for motorized travel, often being referred to as "two-rut" or "woods" roads; many originating from past timber sales. In the roads analysis they were not determined to be essential for the protection, administration and utilization of the forest. Roads deemed essential for these purposes will remain available for public motorized travel. When viewed in combination with county and town roads within the CNNF the total existing road mileage is approximately 9200 miles, of which 4657 are under sole jurisdiction of the Forest Service. Approximately 2703 miles of the 4657 are considered "unauthorized" and are under review for closure. The Department expended significant staff time in providing comments on the 2004 CNNF Plan Revision. WDNR's comments were supportive of the following access and motorized travel-related concepts: " - providing for ATV connector routes with outside trail systems, locating new ATV trails outside of area identified as least suitable for such uses, development of new ATV trails and connectors as provided for in the Forest Plan, limited seasonal motorized use to provide for recreational opportunities, no off trail or off road motorized use, implementing a closed unless posted open philosophy, designating areas in the great divide ranger district adjacent to the clam lake elk and american marten ranges as remote areas with corresponding low road densities, maintaining roads at the lowest density and lowest standard needed for forest management and access purposes.* **Response:** The 2004 Forest Plan included decisions on ATV use, ATV trail development goals and objectives, cross country travel, and road densities (both total and open); however, a decision on the use of HLVs on unauthorized roads (termed as unclassified roads in the Forest Plan) was not clearly articulated. As a result we felt any decisions to exclude the use of these unauthorized roads for HLV use must include further public involvement. Thus the Travel Management Project. The primary focus of this project was to allow for public input on which of these roads should be available for continued motorized use. Since site-specific information about the current status/conditions of these roads is limited, we felt it would be irresponsible to put all of the roads on the map without site-specific review. We have evaluated many of these roads through this initial process and will continue to assess additional roads the public would like for us to evaluate using the adaptive management process outlined in Appendix B of the Decision Notice.
524-4	**Comment:** *(Continued from comment -3) The approved 2004 CNNF Forest Plan addressed all of these concerns to some degree. Passage of the federal Travel Management Rule in 2005 followed closely on the heels of the CNNF Forest Plan approval. Without this rule passage, the roading issues would have likely been addressed project by project as the Plan was implemented. This would have provided for a more local and focused look at road closures in an area and resulted in a more gradual change to the overall motorized road picture on the CNNF. It may have also alerted local user groups more directly. The*

	Department acknowledges that the closure of roads carries impacts to the recreational community. Retaining motorized public access where it does not compromise ecological values, CNNF road density goals, semi-primitive recreation opportunities or otherwise conflict with the Forest Plan is important. The Department would encourage the Forest Service to revisit any road closures that don't fall outside of these sideboards. **Response:** Thank you for your comments. The roading issues will continue to be addressed on a project-by-project basis with site-specific environmental analysis. The outcome of the Travel Management Project is an initial designated network of roads and trails for public motorized use. We expect this network will likely change over time.
524-5	**Comment:** *Of the current options, alternatives #2 and #3 give credence to WDNR concerns communicated during the Plan revision process and that move the CNNF towards goals laid out in the Forest Plan. Roads unnecessary to the management of the Forest, that create erosion and maintenance problems, are surplus to the needs of recreational users including hunters and fishermen, and further compromise the forest ecology, should be looked at seriously for closure. With the exception of those areas designated "non-motorized" in the Forest Plan, it appears that under both alternative #2 & #3 it would be difficult to find an area over 1 mile from the nearest motorized access. This is not dramatically different than the public land norms in Wisconsin. Based on these alternatives, this would amount to motorized road closure of approximately 28% of all the roads on the CNNF. The ability to annually modify the motor vehicle use map (MVUM) is an important provision of the Travel Management Rule and recognizes the inability to accurately predict all of the circumstances that might arise in the future.* **Response:** As noted the MVUM will be updated yearly. The process will include public involvement. In addition, site specific project decisions will also be incorporated into the yearly map updates of the MVUM.
524-6	**Comment:** *Both alternatives #2 and #3 align with the goals and objectives of the existing Forest Plan. Differences are relatively minor on the large scale. More specifically, the WDNR looked closely at the proposed closures adjacent to the Clam Lake elk and American marten ranges and the connectivity for trails in proximity to our Peshtigo River and Flambeau River State Forests. For elk concerns, both alternatives close Forest Road (FR)1265A permanently. This is the most important closure on the whole forest from an elk perspective. In addition, both alternatives seasonally close FR1265/1275 and roads 455, 461, 461B, 461S, 462, and 463. Roads FR 1029 and FR 208A are only seasonally closed for the most part in both alternatives. WDNR would still advocate for permanent closure of FR670A, 672A, 672B and W230469. These are all very short spurs running off of open roads that would have very minimal impact on the recreating public. Leaving these open for fall use might provide opportunities for unauthorized activities within the elk range. For that reason, alternative #2 remains slightly better than #3 for elk.* **Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. We evaluated your suggestion of possibly closing FR670A, 672A, 672B, and W230469 permanently along with comments we received from the public. While our proposal was to have these roads unavailable for public motor vehicle use, the public expressed a desire to have more roads available during the fall season. We have designated these roads as available during the fall season (September 1 – December 31) to accommodate this public value. This would provide access for people during the fall season while also protecting the elk herd during the spring calving season.

524-7	**Comment:** *Another specific issue relates to the proposed ATV connector trail between Oconto and Marinette County trails. This is provided for in both action alternatives. This is a critical regional link between those trail systems and the Forest Service has been a good partner in addressing this issue with our staff in the Northeast Region. Alternative #3 has fewer dependencies on town road connectors and therefore may offer more diverse riding opportunities. We would encourage sustainable trail design that meets user desires. Department staff remains committed to working cooperatively with the Forest Service and other partners to promote and encourage this regional ATV trail network.* **Response:** We will continue to work with partners and interested citizens and groups in the implementation of the goals and objectives in the plan for ATV trail development. These project proposals will be developed and analyzed separately from this effort. Decisions for trail development will be incorporated into subsequent updates of the MVUM.
524-8	**Comment:** *WDNR would like to acknowledge the responsiveness of the Forest Service to concerns voiced during the road analysis process back in the fall of 2007. Again, we would like to reiterate that we would encourage focused collaboration with conservation organizations in order to fully understand their needs. Retaining access and recreational opportunities for our motorized and non-motorized publics alike remains a delicate balance.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 524-1.
524-9	**Comment:** *While the alternatives #2 and #3 are similar when looked at forest-wide, WDNR is of the opinion that the increased seasonal use of some routes in the fall under alternative #3 may provide a marginally better opportunity for hunting. We would continue to advocate for the recommended road closures in the Clam Lake elk range as referenced above. If this remains a possibility we would encourage you to contact elk biologist Laine Stowell directly at our Hayward office. WDNR encourages the Forest Service to collaborate with affected groups and would appreciate reconsideration of selected roads adjacent to the Clam Lake elk range. Thank you for your continued communication with the Department on the CNNF Travel Management project. We are hopeful that our comments are helpful in determining the preferred alternative.* **Response:** Thank you for your continued engagement in this project and for your specific comments and feedback.
525-1	**Comment:** *In reviewing the EA we ask that you consider the impact road closures may have on future forest management activities both on the CNNF and also on adjacent forestlands, including county forests. The ability to access forests for silvicultural, forest health and forest protection reasons is a significant concern to WCFA.* **Response:** Thank you for your concern regarding Forest management. The Travel Management Rule designates roads and trails for public motorized use. Administrative use by Forest Service personnel is not affected by this project. Please see response to comment 404-1.
525-2	**Comment:** *WCFA is part of a coalition working towards a statewide ban on the baiting and feeding of deer. Large deer populations in WI are taking a toll on forest flora and in some areas are hampering the ability to regenerate forests. We are concerned that the ability of hunters to access areas of the forest and work towards meeting wildlife management goals may be*

	hindered by road closures in some areas of the CNNF. **Response:** We are committed to providing the appropriate balance of access to facilitate the attainment of management goals for the deer herd. Please see responses to comment 229-1 and 355-2.
525-3	**Comment:** *Accessibility to lakes for fishing or scenic enjoyment is another concern. It appears as though some roads that now afford public access to within ? mile from lakes within CNNF boundaries may be closed. Some of these lakes have private landholdings and development on their shores and closure of public access routes would make these bodies of water virtually private.* **Response:** We intend to provide an appropriate balance of access for Forest users to support a variety of uses on the CNNF. If there are specific access routes or lakes you or your members have concerns about please let us know. We will continue to assess site-specific access needs through project planning.
525-4	**Comment:** *When comparing the mileage figures presented in the EA it appears as though nearly 60% of total forest service road miles available for motorized use will be lost. This seems like a significant number of miles to be closed at one time, thus making the project effects far reaching.* **Response:** In our decision we added approximately 205 additional miles of roads to our travel system, which equates to a 49% reduction of the miles of roads under sole Forest Service jurisdiction. These roads are only part the total miles of roads accessing the Forest. The towns, counties, and the State have jurisdiction over approximately half of the roads accessing the Forest. The 49% of miles of sole Forest Service jurisdiction roads equates to 25% of total miles of roads on the Forest. There will be a total of approximately 6,800 miles of roads under all jurisdictions accessing the Forest. Most of the roads that will be unavailable for motorized use are unauthorized roads, which are not part of the current travel system. Many of these roads are only accessible by high clearance vehicles or not accessible at all. Additionally, the number of miles of ATV trails increased by 16 miles on the west side of the Forest. We encourage your participation in providing input to the MVUM as it is updated each year. The more specific the feedback, the better we can accommodate your needs and interests.
525-5	**Comment:** *There is concern regarding the method of relaying closed roads to public users. We understand closed roads will be defined on the MVUM, but there is concern with the ability of occasional users of the CNNF to know where they are in relation to the map they are reading. We encourage the CNNF to consider some form of clearly identifying closed roads to the public.* **Response:** We understand your concern. The MVUM will display the roads and trails that will be available to public motorized use and will be available free of charge at all Forest offices and on the CNNF website. We have also committed to signing with a road/trail number at the major and interior intersections of designated roads and trails. ATV routes will be signed with both a number and an ATV placard. It will likely take some time to completely sign these intersections. During our first year of implementation, law enforcement officials will focus on education and the proper use of the MVUM. They will also help people understand that they can continually provide specific information on roads and trails for future MVUM updates.

525-6	**Comment:** *In closing roads that may be used to access "old growth" or "special" areas of the CNNF you may be limiting the ability of the public to observe and take part in these special areas. Only those members of the public capable of walking long distances will be able to view these unique areas of the forest. The national forest belongs to everyone, even those without the capabilities to walk long distances. Retaining motorized access where possible without compromising soil and water quality, or ecological goals outlined in the CNNF Plan is important to the public owners of the forest. Increased public support for "old growth" or "special" areas may be possible if more users are able to enjoy and appreciate these areas.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We welcome people with all abilities to the Forest; please see response to letter 260-1. Our decision provides for sustainable and accessible network while minimizing environmental impacts.
525-7	**Comment***: If a road is closed and in the future there is sufficient, legitimate need for having that road reopened, what will be the proper procedure for getting that accomplished? This process has not been outlined in the EA and perhaps if it were some concerns could be alleviated.* **Response:** Thank you for your question. We will be using an adaptive management approach for considering the addition (or deletion) or roads from the MVUM. We will continually take suggestions from the public and these suggestions will be considered and analyzed. We encourage the public to stay engaged and to let us know what is important to them. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for further information.
525-8	**Comment:** *WCFA would like to acknowledge the importance of having the proposed ATV connector trail between Oconto and Marinette County included in both Alternative #2 and Alternative #3. WCFA is not opposed to the use of road closures as a tool for managing public lands. Many county forests use this tool to protect sensitive sites, discourage forest user conflict and also to help prevent the introduction and spread of exotic invasive species. We simply encourage you to consider our concerns when decisions are made regarding road closures. In addition, continued communication with forest user and conservation interest groups may be beneficial. We would offer that perhaps a more detailed analysis is required for some of the proposed closures to ensure our concerns are adequately addressed.* **Response:** We welcome comments and input and look forward to continuing to work with you. In addition to inclusion on project-specific mailing lists, you will be informed of opportunities to comment on future updates. Regarding the ATV connector trail you mention, the ATV connector trail was included in both alternatives, but it was displayed incorrectly on the map. These roads were reviewed based on public and internal comments. Designation in the selected alternative is for HLVs as well as ATVs.
526-1	**Comment:** *The USFS has made giant strides in protecting some of the elk management and elk calving zone by closing many of the roads within it to ATV use. It would be best for the USFS to continue this type of good stewardship. To that end I make these comments.* **Response:** We appreciate your input on the elk area.
526-2	**Comment:** *Alternative 1 is unacceptable, period. As to the other two proposals; Alternatives 2 and 3 leave Forest Road 671*

	open for ATVs to run on while closing all other roads in the vicinity to ATV traffic. Do not infer from my statement that I believe the solution would be to open more roads in this area to ATV use; it is just the opposite, leaving FR 671 open to ATV use is unacceptable. This area is my backyard and I walk it often. Leaving FR 671 open is not practical. Forest Road 671 is a road which begins and ends at two separate points that connect to FR 208, which is closed to ATV use. There are numerous other logging roads which connect to FR 671. Of course the ATVers will not know whether or not they are on FR 671- at least this will be their excuse for riding anywhere they like. It would become a virtual playground because of all of the other logging roads connecting to FR 671. FR 208 is a Spider Lake Township road which is closed to all ATV use. Why would the USFS close all of the other logging roads in this area, as proposed in Alternative 2 and 3, yet leave FR 671 open to ATV use when it connects to FR 208, a town road which is closed to ATV use? And why would the USFS leave FR 671 open to ATV use when there are a multitude of other logging roads which connect to it? And again, it is an elk calving area.&#65007;&#65007; I urge the USFS to ALSO close FR 671 to make this small elk calving area a place of peace and quiet for them. I remind you that Laine Stowell-DNR Elk Biologist has stated that any motorized intrusion on the logging roads is not good for the elk. **Response:** FR 671 was recommended for closure to ATVs. The road designation on the final map may be an error. We are currently checking into this discrepancy.
527-1	**Comment:** *The area I hunt on that forest road is over a mile in. One guest I often hunt with has bad knees and cannot walk more than a few hundred yards on flat ground. If that forest road or the loop were closed he could no longer hunt there. I also have a bad back, bad shoulder, and a knee that gets flaky. I could walk the distance in (now) but it would take me a long time. When hunting I often only hunt for a few hours, adding another 3 hours of walking would make it impractical to hunt there. Also, when putting bear baits out (Starting April 15) I could be carrying or carting 20 gallons of bait. It is not realistic to be spending 4 hours to tend a few bait sites that I have way back in there. Exactly the same situation occurred on a Douglas county road several years ago. That road, also about 1.5 miles back was accessible by ATV and to some degree by trucks. My friend with the bad knees and I hunted back there and baited for bear on that road. We can no longer in any practical sense hunt deer or bait bears in that area since the road was closed. The same has also happened to us on a couple of roads we bear hunt on in the National Forest in Minnesota.* **Response:** We appreciate your desire to continue your hunting tradition. The MVUM map will be updated annually and the Forest will accept comments for additions or deletions for specific roads of concern. Please let us know specifically which roads you use to hunt. We will include them for consideration in our next update to the MVUM. Our decision includes a process for continually accepting and considering specific road suggestions from the public. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice.
527-2	**Comment:** *This forest road and the other roads that connect to it are not at risk for damage due to ATV or truck traffic. For the most part they are hard sand/rock base. There is no ecological reason to close them.* **Response:** Thank you for your input. Please see response to comment 527-1.
527-3	**Comment:** *Also, this road provides access to private land where the road ends. If you close it those owners and their guests*

	would no longer have vehicle access to their property. **Response:** We can include this road on our MVUM making it available for public motorized use. Please let us know what this road is specifically. Please also note that private access to private property is not dependent on public access. Private access to private property for owners and their guests can be secured over roads that are no longer open to the public; the private land owner would need to contact the Forest for a special use permit.
527-4	**Comment:** *Closing roads seasonally and opening them starting on September 15th will not work. That misses the entire bear dog training season, all of the bear baiting season, half of the bear hunting season, leach/minnow trapping time, fishing season, and a lot of other activities that go on during the late spring and summer.* **Response:** Thank you for this suggestion. In our decision we modified the fall access season to September 1 to December 31 to accommodate the fall hunting seasons. Please see the Decision Notice, page 3.
527-5	**Comment:** *Another side effect, if somewhere around 50% of the forest roads get closed that will shift a lot of users onto the other half that have not been closed. This will obviously cause congestion in the open road areas and likely over populations of game species where roads were closed.* **Response:** Thank you for expressing your concern. Others also expressed this same concern. Please see response to comment 217-1 for a discussion about hunters and motorized access. Please also see responses to comments 229-1 and 355-2.
527-6	**Comment:** *The national forest was established to provide the average person access to these great natural resources. In Wisconsin the concept was also promoted to boost the local economy by giving locals a way to earn an income by guiding hunters and fishermen, trapping, and such things on the forest land. It was also to bring tourists to the northwoods to use the forest and spend money with local business in the process. Closing these roads is in direct conflict with that mission statement. From what I have read the closures would also be in direct conflict with presidential directives. Please do NOT close any of these roads in the proposals. (except maybe by emergency orders for a couple of weeks when the frost comes out) My stand on this is in strong support of Alternative 1, until such time as each section of road has been inventoried to determine the costs and benefits of closing to the Forest Service, local economy, and all forest users. We wish to make it clear that we do NOT take the position that all the road closings are a bad idea. But the public does not have the information it needs to make an informed decision on a road by road basis and neither does the Forest Service.* **Response:** We are committed to providing an appropriate balance of access opportunities for Forest visitors. We will continue the process of assessing roads site specifically as we continue to plan projects to implement the Forest Plan. In addition, we will assess all roads the public requests we consider. We will utilize the same processes which are described in Appendix B of the Decision Notice. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
529-1	**Comment:** *Devastating effect on the management of the national forest if this large percentage of the roads are closed. With the coming of the ash borer, we will need all the roads just to remove the ash species from the forest before it is lost to salvage. It*

	seems to me that any road closure of this magnitude would have to be handled by an amendment to the forest plan. The economic consequence will be huge if allowed to proceed from the loss of timber revenue and recreation dollars to the many business establishments that depend on the recreation dollars from hunting, fishing, snowmobile use and ATV use. This seems to be just another step in shutting down a large portion of the Nicolet Chequamegon National Forest as wilderness for the enjoyment of only a small segment of the population. Hardwood management is already at a standstill on the forest and even with the roads that you now have you are not operating in accordance with the plan. **Response:** No roads will be physically closed as a result of this decision. We will continue our assessment of roads to ensure we have an adequate network of roads for administrative access as well as public access. This effort is focused solely on public wheeled motorized vehicle access. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
530-1	**Comment:** *The WSC-NWTF is asking the US Forest Service to approve Alternative 1. Our concerns are this: no complete analysis of the far reaching effects of these closures has been adequately studied. This proposal of restricting access to 55% of the motorized vehicle access roads should be done on a road by road basis carefully analyzing the effects of all user groups. We strongly oppose alternatives 2 and 3. We feel these will serve only to restrict hunting, fishing and trapping within those areas; which is a constitutional right granted to the citizens of Wisconsin.* **Response:** We are committed to providing an appropriate balance of motorized and non-motorized access to support hunting, fishing, trapping and other public uses. We will continue to evaluate roads the public brings to our attention for consideration as well as our on-going efforts to assess and evaluate all roads on the CNNF to determine the overall long-term transportation system. The decision includes an adaptive management process that is described in Appendix B of the Decision Notice. We look forward to continuing to work with your organization to support access needs.
530-2	**Comment:** *We see this proposal as a further restriction on sportsmen's access to these lands. It is preposterous to assume that an able-bodied person will hike many miles with provisions and gear to their camping, hunting or fishing spots when that person formerly could drive a car or ATV to that spot. Even more concerning to us is the fact that as our population ages, many of the individuals who have used these areas are now becoming less mobile and possibly disabled and will be unable to access them at all. This quite frankly concerns us. We have been encouraging our disabled citizens, through our Wheelin' Sportsman's program, to get out and enjoy nature - and it seems that you are poised to take this initiative back many steps. We would also like to remind you that it is illegal to quarter a deer for transport to the registration area.* **Response:** It is important for sportsmen to let us know the roads they utilize that are not already designated on the map for motorized access. We understand the importance of being able to access traditional camping, hunting, and fishing spots. We also understand the importance of providing access for citizens of all abilities. We will continue to provide a balance of access opportunities. Many of the unauthorized roads that were note considered for placement on the map are in accessible; however, we know there are likely many roads that people utilize that we are not aware of. We encourage all users to bring these roads to our attention for evaluation.

530-3	**Comment:** *This proposal is destined to have a significant financial impact on an already economically challenged area. The towns and their businesses are tourism based. Any fluctuation in the number of people who travel to the area has an enormous impact on them. Hunting, fishing and trapping generates a large portion of revenue for the local economy in those areas and also for our DNR's budget. The DNR is already facing budget challenges due to fewer hunting licenses being issued. We don't want to see that revenue fall even further due to hunters leaving the sport because of the closure of these roads.* **Response:** Thank you for your concern about the local economy. Others expressed a similar concern. Please see response to comment 332-3 and Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
530-4	**Comment:** *We along with other sporting organizations are in agreement in our opposition to closing such a vast area of effective access. These closures would have a significant impact on all forms of recreation to include, but not limited to hunting, fishing, trapping, dog training, camping, and access to private property.* **Response:** It is important we provide an appropriate balance of access for all users. We are committed to doing that as we continue to access roads and develop trail systems to balance these needs. We understand your concerns and ask you to work with us to more specifically define your needs within certain areas of the Forest. We would like to meet with you or your organization to discuss these needs.
531-1	**Comment:** *I'd like to comment on the Travel Management Rule (TMR) for the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest (CNFF) proposal. In examining the different proposals in the TMR environmental assessment, I'd prefer option one over the other two options presented. Option one retains the most mileage of the different types of 'roads' as defined by the USFS. My interests in these are using them on our street legal dual-sport on/off road motorcycles. Because of a lack of a registration program in Wisconsin for OHM (off-highway motorcycles) and 4X4 vehicles, we have very few miles of trails in the state; about 50 miles of single track for the OHM riders and 7 miles of trails for the 4X4 vehicle (the Pipeline). The OHM are allowed on some ATV trails in the state, but outside of USFS land, the bikes are not included in the definition of an ATV. Thus it's up to the individual counties to allow or disallow the dirt bikes use on their ATV trails. Recent loss of ATV trails to non-street legal dirt bikes in Jackson County only exasperates and emphasizes the problem of a general lack of OHM trails in the state.* **Response:** We encourage you to continue to work with us to assess opportunities to meet your interests. All proposals will need to be consistent with the direction in the Forest Plan. It is our intent to continue to develop trail systems to accomplish the objectives in the Plan.
531-2	**Comment:** *I don't like seeing existing 'roads' closed; once they are gone it's hard to get them back or get replacement miles. It's recognized that the USFS has limited resources to maintain all of them. But the trails not being maintained at this time should still be available; they are still being used even if sporadically, and they still remain useful to potential users. Hunters and others already help keep them 'in use' even if they are only used sporadically during the hunting season or to get to favorite fishing or Kayaking sites. If we lose them now then we may have lost them for years to come with little chance for replacement. I'm worried that because of staffing and funding issues and despite the best of intentions, that we would have little action and a general lack*

	of response from the USFS if we close down existing 'roads' and then ask for more trails in the future. Option 2 I find unacceptable because of the loss of trails and roads and no additional mileage. Option 3 has some merit because of the important increase in new ATV trails and roads added to the Eastern portion of the forest with the ongoing projects that appear on the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest April-June 2008 Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA). But the loss of 'road' mileage makes it unacceptable overall. I'd propose that option 1 with the addition of the new trails being developed in option 3 would be the best overall solution. **Response:** It is important for us to continue to map and define the overall transportation system on the CNNF. This includes both roads and trails. We will continue to assess all of the unauthorized roads to determine whether they will be added to the transportation system, considered for trail development or decommissioned. This will be an on-going process. As a result the MVUM will change over time. We encourage you to continue to work with us and help us further understand your specific interests.
532-1	**Comment:** *I'd like to get more information on exactly which roads are scheduled to be closed. While I could be swayed to support limited closure of unimproved logging access roads, I cannot get behind closing of roads that have been improved. For example, I know or two roads that would highlight the differences. Both roads are in the lower Chequamegon near Perkinstown. One had been a very nice gravel road that used to be completely open for travel, and then was closed and made a hunters walking trail? except during the deer gun season. This made no sense at all as the road traversed large, open hardwoods. What exactly are you going to hunt in that, except maybe deer with a gun? The road is now always gated and closed, even during the gun season. It would be an excellent ATV path, except this is not allowed. This effectively closes a huge chunk of real estate to hunting by all but the most fit individuals. The second road is west of the one above, due west across the Yellow River. This had been a logging road and leads to some really nice beaver ponds used by duck hunters. Since it has more recently been cut for pulp it offers outstanding Ruffed Grouse hunting by the walking hunter. This is an excellent road to close as it actually offers hunting opportunities along the entire length. While it has been tank trapped, ATV's user frequently go around that. This seems like the right kind of road to close* **Response:** Thank you for your comment but unfortunately due to the lack of specific examples we were unable to tell you the exact reasons why these roads are currently designated the way they are. If a gate or closure device has been installed on a road it was done under a previous decision. The TMR decision did not include any roads that were closed by previous decision. With the adoption of the Travel Management Rule you will be seeing more enforcement of closed roads to all motorized activity, including ATVs. This increase will be in large part due to the associated map. This map will give Law Enforcement a better navigational tool to determine the status of roads within the National Forest. Roads that have been continually used by motorized traffic behind berms will be easier to spot thus making Law Enforcement more efficient. If possible please let us know the numbers and specific locations of the roads you spoke of. We have the ability to analyze roads to be included in future map updates as well as strengthen any current closure devices and inform appropriate law enforcement personnel.

532-2	**Comment:** *I guess the bottom line is the most frequent use of these national forests is by hunters. Please make this a priority use in your considerations. While it makes sense to close roads that offer improved hunting by closure, it makes no sense to close roads that are really access paths to good hunting. I also feel that limited ATV use should be allowed on many roads during the deer gun season for the purpose of retrieving deer after the kill. Obviously, I have an interest in a specific area. I am part owner of 80 acres kind of between the two roads mentioned. While I'd love to see total closure since our property would then offer the only access, I still believe that these decisions must be weighed against the access needs of the general public. Please limit the number of roads closed to those that offer improved hunting by their closure. Do not close roads just to create some 'wilderness' areas. I have spent a lot of time in the lower Chequamegon and believe me, most of the time it is wilderness. There is little to no use during the bulk of the year, except by bear and deer hunters. That is realistically the main use of the forest is today. Do not fall into the thinking that we need some sanctuary so people in some far away city feel good about what they have done, and send money to the extremist group promoting closing of these lands. Please understand, I don't want to turn the National Forest into an ATV playground, but there needs to be the provision made to allow use of an ATV for specific purposes. I understand that is an enforcement problem, and there have been many abuses in the past. That is no excuse for a draconian closure plan.* **Response:** We are committed to providing an appropriate balance of motorized and non-motorized access to support hunting and other public uses. We will continue to evaluate roads the public brings to our attention for consideration as well as our on-going efforts to assess and evaluate all roads on the CNNF to determine the overall long-term transportation system. The decision includes an adaptive management process that is described in Appendix B of the Decision Notice.
533-1	**Comment:** *I believe that the Forest service closing the old logging roads would cut off many of the small lakes and trails within the national forest to families that like to explore the back woods. Growing up my family would dig out the map book and navigate the logging roads until we came to the end and would hike back to the nearest lake and enjoy the beauty and quiet. Although some outdoor enthusiasts may consider us lazy, I would have never been able to enjoy the parts of the north woods that I saw as the oldest of 3 children because you just cannot expect to have a pleasant, relaxing 5 mile hike off a major road with 3 children under the age of twelve, but a 1 to 2 mile hike out of the end of a logging road isn't so much to ask. I do understand and appreciate that the woods may be better off without SUV's driving down roads that are expensive to patrol and maintain. But isn't part of preserving our national forests also educating future generations to appreciate them? I think that closing the roads will cut off a large section of the population that otherwise would not have been able to see a remote campground before the age of 10.* **Response:** We are committed to providing an appropriate balance of motorized and non-motorized access to support access for all Forest visitors. We appreciate your sharing your experience and the importance of access to your family. We will continue to evaluate roads the public brings to our attention for consideration as well as our on-going efforts to assess and evaluate all roads on the CNNF to determine the overall long-term transportation system. The decision includes an adaptive management process that is described in Appendix B of the Decision Notice. We encourage you to stay engaged and provide us feedback as you continue to utilize the Forest.

534-1	**Comment:** *Thank you for opening FR 330 in Drummond Township (T.45N-R.8W). Although I was hoping there would be no restrictions. Also, in the same area I would appreciate if you would review opening FR W513121, W513120, 51446, which connects to 51444, which is open for seasonal use. My family and I hunt that area and I am 69 Yrs. young and not able to walk into that area from the remaining access points. Also: Comments in your road list stated that the Forest Service was considering FR330 as a trail head in the future. I think FR W513121 would provide a better trail head site.* **Response:** Thank you for your road-specific comments. The following roads and proposed designations were reviewed. Designations for these roads in the selected alternative are: W513121 - HLV and ATV; We decided to open this small spur from 330 west to 229 to give the public a route around private land. W513120, 51446 - none; District staff ground checked this area and there are numerous roads in this area that need to be looked at in great detail to determine if an adequate loop exists. All roads identified by the commenter will be re-evaluated as part of the upcoming Nancy Lake project scale analysis that will begin in October 2008. Suggest the commenter stay engaged with the progress of the Nancy Lake project. Please contact the Washburn Ranger District for more information on the Nancy Lake project.
534-2	**Comment:** *FR 229 H: This Rd should be opened to HLV and ATV's as a connector to Beck RD. (FR229)* **Response:** FR 229H was analyzed and designated for HLV in the selected alternative. ATV use will not be designated and will maintain this road at current condition and defer ATV designation to site specific analysis in Nancy Lake (project scale analysis 2008/2009) for next MVUM update. Please contact the Washburn Ranger District for information on the Nancy Lake project.
534-3	**Comment:** *FR393: You are proposing closure of this road, I am asking you not to close it. It provides a nice scenic loop for ATV riding, from Jahns Rd. to FR398 and back to Jahns Rd. It is all high and dry trail through that area. Make it seasonal if nothing else.* **Response:** FR 393 was reviewed and designated for HLV in the selected alternative. We made the recommendation to leave this road open as a connector road in the Town of Drummond. Although the condition of this road is marginal (overgrown), the value is high. The road is in an RNA; however, no risks have been brought forward.
534-4	**Comment:** *FR400: Your proposal indicates HLV only, if pickups and motorcycles are allowed ATV's should be OK also. It would be a great East-West connector route between FR399 and North Delta Rd.(FR 228) and Beck Rd (FR229) and over to a major North South dual purpose Snowmobile and ATV trail (trail 31), between Iron River and Drummond, Barnes area. Economic factor.* **Response:** FR 400 was reviewed and designated for HLV in the selected alternative. Rationale for restricting ATV use is due to the road traversing a research natural area.
534-5	**Comment:** *FR 514125: This Rd is only open on your alternative 3 proposal. It is important that no matter which proposal you*

	choose, FR 514125 must be open. It is an important link to the existing trail system to the North. Economic factor for the area. **Response:** We assumed the commenter was referring to Road W514125 as no road 514125 exists in our inventory. This road (W514125) is also part of the Forest motorized trail system, therefore was reviewed and designated for ATV in the selected alternative.
534-6	**Comment:** *FR 51442: In the comment column of your data base, It references FR51422, which is not in the area. FR51442 is another trail I would like to see open, I would be a connector between W51445 or 51446 to W51444.* **Response:** Road 51442 was reviewed and no change was made regarding the road at this time. It will not be available for motorized use; however the Forest is in the initial stages of conducting project scale analysis that encompasses the area this road is located in. At the project scale all roads will be evaluated in the area, with possible designated motorized use. Please contact the Washburn Ranger District for more information on the project-level analysis for this road.
534-7	**Comment:** *It is stated that UTV (Utility Type Vehicles)are not allowed on Forest Service Rds./Trails. I am involved with the snowmobiling community and every fall we have a couple days of trail cleanup, sign replacement or installation, cutting brush back, removing blow downs, trees leaning over the trails that would be a hazard when weighted with snow, and general trail cleaning. These vehicles are very handy for carrying signs, saws, post hole diggers, posts, and in general all the equipment to do the job. Pick-ups also will do the same, but volunteers are reluctant to take their $30,000 pick-up into the woods when they have a UTV at their disposal. In general UTV owners are more responsible people than some pick-up drivers or ATV drivers. There sould be some provision included in your TMR where we can use these vehicles.* **Response:** The definition of an ATV on the National Forest mirrors the State's definition, and UTVs do not fall within the State's definition of an ATV. UTVs are not allowed on State roads or trails at this time other than on a trial basis in a few northern counties. We will monitor the State's handling of UTVs in the future and we may consider allowing UTVs at that time.
534-8	**Comment:** *There is an existing railroad bed between FR 811 (Arne Carlson Rd.) and the village of Drummond. It is an existing snowmobile trail (Trail 63) and I have been trying for two years to get it designated as an ATV trail. It has been used as such for a number of years. If it was officially opened to ATV's there would be State funds available to maintain it and it would be placed on the Bayfield County ATV map. It would provide a major connection to the North and East. Also an Economic factor.* **Response:** The abandoned railroad grade the commenter is referring to is in fact Forest Trail (FT) 501. The trail has been evaluated and designated for ATV in the selected alternative. Use by snowmobiles will continue.
534-9	**Comment:** *I would support Alternative 3* **Response:** Thank you for taking the time to review the documents and provide your feedback.
534-10	**Comment:** *I am involved with the snomobile and ATV trail system in Bayfield County and have enjoyed working with the*

	Forestry Department in the past and look forward to the same relationship in the future. Thank You! **Response:** Thank you for being involved and working closely with us.
535-1	**Comment:** *We are asking for Alternative 1 to be approved - which is in effect the "no action" option. We do NOT object to a road by road analysis which would result in the closing of some forest roads, but this analysis has not been done and there is no alternative presented to accomplish this result. The Forest Service is proposing under Alternatives 2 or 3 to close 2577 miles of access roads in the Nicolet and Chequamegon National Forests. That represents over 55% of the total motorized vehicle access roads. These closings are proposed without there ever having been an analysis of each individual roadway to determine the environmental, social, or economic impact of the closure. The environmental benefits of the proposed closures are expressed in broad policy goals in the environmental assessment. The social, environmental, and economic costs of effectively closing large tracts of public lands to the public are glossed over or ignored. A simplistic 23 page Environmental Assessment is hardly sufficient given the huge consequences of this action. For example the economic impact is considered non-significant. In our discussions with Forest Service personnel their explanation was that they assumed everyone who visited the north would still keep coming, even though now they may have to walk miles and miles to access their activity, when for generations they could drive directly to their hunting, fishing, or other nature-based activity. You have presented no facts to back up this assertion.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concerns. The decision includes an adaptive management process that will allow us to continue to assess roads for consideration for inclusion on the map (please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice). It is important that you let us know if there are roads you use that do not show up on the map you would like for us to evaluate. We are committed to providing a balance of motorized and non-motorized access for Forest users and do not expect everyone to walk for miles to enjoy hunting, fishing and other activities. It is not, however, reasonable for us to maintain all of these miles of road (many of them are no longer accessible), but we intend to assess all roads in time. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
535-2	**Comment:** *It is only common sense to realize that a family now consisting of a 12 year old son, his father, and 70 year old grandfather could have enjoyed a hunting experience 3 miles down a soon-to-be-closed forest road for generations. That experience will be now destroyed, as it will become completely impossible for them to hike in the 3 miles and then hike out again carrying a harvested deer or bear. So for that family unit, and for thousands more, large tracts of public lands will be effectively closed. Many will give up hunting; many will choose other more easily accessible tracts on private or state lands - increasing hunter pressure in those areas.* **Response**: Please see response to letter 180-1; also, please consider submitting road-specific concerns for evaluation in the annual MVUM update.
535-3	**Comment:** *Also in our discussions, it became clear that you may not have any good environmental reason to close even some sensitive roads during the fall. Many roads could be considered for closing during the spring for erosion control or during the season when the young of certain species are being reared. By fall, these reasons may be no longer relevant. We could easily*

	support seasonal closing of some forest roads, but that is not an option presented in the assessment! (We note that Alternative 3 does include a miniscule 42 miles of "seasonal access" but even these roads are only open starting on September 15th, which missing the entire bear dog training season and half of the actual hunting season!) **Response:** Thank you for this suggestion. In our decision we modified the fall access season to Sept 1 to Dec 31 to accommodate the fall hunting seasons. Please see the Decision Notice page 3.
535-4	**Comment:** *Lastly we have inquired as to why over half the roads were proposed to be closed without any inventory, or any road by road analysis. We were told "because that would be a lot of work for the service." We expect a certain level of due diligence and competence from our Federal agencies that is clearly lacking in this proposal. The sporting groups in Wisconsin are united in opposition to this unprecedented closing of large tracts of northern Wisconsin to effective use by the public. The Hunters Rights Coalition strongly takes a stand in support of Alternative 1, until such time as each section of road has been inventoried to determine the costs and benefits of closing. We wish to make it clear that we do NOT take the position that all the road closings are a bad idea. But the public does not have the information it needs to make an informed decision and neither does the Forest Service.* **Response:** The decision includes an additional 205 miles of roads that were added to the map as a result of site-specific proposals for road assessments. We will continue to assess all unauthorized roads on the Forest to determine whether they should be available for public motorized use. This process will occur over time. In the meantime, we have included an adaptive management process to allow for roads to be considered for inclusion on the map in subsequent updates.
536-1	**Comment:** *Hello, I am a Coloradan who hunts in your great state. I make as many trips out there as I can to hunt turkey, deer, and small game birds. I travel over 1000 miles one way by truck just to spend time and money in Minnesota. I use the backcounrty roads for much of my scouting, and hunting. I have seen my own home state face the same road plans as Minnesota. The closeing of Colorado forest roads has lead to a sharp decline in out of state hunters and adventure minded people. As such we have lost millions of dollars that used to pay into the health of our lands. Please think about this issue with an eye on the impact that it will have on the desire of out of state Minnesota land users to travel there. I will rethink my plans to travel to any state that closes land access. As a side note my trips to hunt in Minnesota tend to cost me around $2500 per hunting trip. That money is spent on gas, hotels, gear, licenses, ammo, food, and much more. As a state are you willing to suffer the lost income of people like me over the question of roads that are already in place? What will the state as a whole truely gain from closeing roads? In Colorado we have lost over 4500 out of state hunters per year in the last 5 years due to land issues. My friends that is an average of $55,000 yearly loss, and each year the state ups that estimate. Please do not make the same error as Colorado.* **Response:** Access for hunting is an important feature and use of the roads on the CNNF. We appreciate your feedback and concerns.
537-1	**Comment:** *As a Wisconsinite I enjoy taking drives in the 'Northwoods' of Wisconsin. Closure of these roads would hinder*

	viewing of areas and hinder Fire and rescue personnel from reaching remote areas. I also be leave it is in the best interest of the forest to keep said roads open to help prevent major fires like those in California. It also is a draw of income to the local Governments, and brings income to local people, especially during the fall color change to the woods. It helps bring people to the areas and helps bolster up the economy. Closure of these roads will hinder logging and access to by truck to logging areas. **Response:** This decision will ensure over 6,800 miles of road are available for public motorized access. We believe there will be plenty of access for the purposes that draw people to the northwoods. This decision does not affect access for administrative purposes such as fire suppression and timber harvesting. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
537-2	**Comment:** *Please consider leaving all the roads open. Instead look for Private Road sponsors. Such as: Logging companies Off-road groups, Jeep clubs Snowmobile clubs ATV clubs Hunting clubs Most would jump at a chance to help out.* **Response:** We agree with your ideas on partnership and maintenance. The Forest would assist in a start-up discussion with a partnership organization. Groups that have funded projects on the Forest generally operate with very little Forest oversight and are chartered self-sustaining organizations.
538-1	**Comment:** *Peace and quiet are rare commodities in our fast-paced world. Going to the forest or woods, used to be a way to escape the noise of the world and hear yourself think again or refresh your soul. With the advent of machines that could drive over and through anything and everything, this has been denied those who seek quiet. The loss of quiet is only one of the losses of having machines in the forest. They also cause destruction and bring into the forest invasive species of plants and microorganisms causing further ruin of the soothing green feeling provided by a forest. And that only addresses the loss to humans. There is also the loss of habitat for the wild creatures whose home has always been the forest. When those creatures, such as wolves and coyotes adapt the living around men, we ask for the right to shoot them. Please proceed to close roads and trails for motorized vehicles so that all lovers of quiet, silent sports and the native creatures of the woods have one last remaining place. For the silent sport enthusiasts it allows them to enjoy the forest as it once was, quiet. For the creatures, it is there home. Please do not allow further destruction of their home. Keep the forest quiet and proceed with the plans to close roads.* **Response:** It is important for us to provide a balance of motorized and non-motorized access to the National Forest. We believe this decision provides that balance. If there are certain trails or roads you are concerned about please let us know. The more specific your input the more helpful it will be for us to assess and respond.
539-1	**Comment:** *I believe that the forest service has made major flaws in the whole Travel Management Rule. The idea that one plan will work in all forest and all regions of the country is not plausible.* **Response:** We believe that a designated route system is appropriate for public motorized use and can be very effective in providing adequate access while ensuring we are able to sustain the resources on the National Forest. This decision is tailored to the needs of citizens who utilize this Forest. It will continue to be developed in collaboration with people who use this Forest.

539-2	**Comment:** *I can not support Alt. 2 or Alt.3 be because of the lack of access they both provide to the public owned lands in the CNNF. Not only does the elimination of this many roads restrict access for hunters, anglers, berry pickers and other users, but will completely eliminate access for the handicapped and anyone that can not walk miles to enjoy the forest. These alternatives will endanger the entire forest by removing access needed to fight any threat from fires. Many of these roads are needed to access areas that need to be logged (which already is not being harvested according the Land Management Plan) to keep a healthy forest.* **Response:** The decision includes public motorized access on over 6,800 miles of road. If there are specific roads or trails that are important for your access please let us know. Please also note this decision does not affect access for administrative purposes such as fire suppression and Forest management.
539-3	**Comment:** *Alt. 2 & 3 of this plan do not meet many of the directions of the forest plan standards and guidelines. It also doesn't meet the requirement of the general initiative of the travel management rule that stated that motorized use was a legitimate use in the national forest.* **Response:** Motorized use is a legitimate use of the National Forest. The decision includes many miles of road for all kinds of wheeled motorized use, and is consistent with the Forest Plan.
539-4	**Comment:** *Another flaw in the proposed alternatives in the lack of on the ground signage to alert the recreating public when a road is no longer open. The idea that everyone is going to get a map and then be able to determine on that map which roads are open and which are not, is not reasonable.* **Response:** We understand your concerns and are committed to helping people understand where they may be in relation to the map. The MVUM will be available free of charge at all Forest offices and on the CNNF website. We will sign with a road/trail number at the major and interior intersections of designated roads and trails. ATV routes will be signed with both a number and a ATV placard. This process may take some time to complete. All authorized roads and trails may not be signed by the time the MVUM will be available in January 2009.
540-1	**Comment:** *I would like to comment on the proposed changes to Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest Travel Management Project. I live in the Great Divide Ranger District on Beaver Dam Lake and the Brunsweiler River. I know of two forest roads that have been abused: Forest Roads 187A and 189A. These roads are off of Mineral Lake Road and Spring Brook Road. I have witnesses on several occasions? subjects riding ATV's and snowmobiles far past where these roads allow. When re posted this past fall, the postings remain for only a few days. The violators do not stop at this point, and will ride through the river to access areas that are not open to any form of motor vehicle. The use of ATV and motorized vehicle's has caused marked deterioration to the ground cover and there is extensive soil erosion. I have walked these areas and have picked up various types of litter. I would like to see these roads restricted to foot traffic only as described in Alternative 2. This Alternative 2 would also allow for easier patrolling of these areas, and prevention of further deterioration and noted violations.*

	Response: This is a duplicate comment to 509-1; please see response to comment 509-1.
541-1	**Comment:** *I fully support alternative 2. Alternative 1, status quo, has lead to significant degradation in area along and just beyond the currently open roads. The use of ATVs at any time of the year has caused wetland damage and significant erosion in the Great Divide management area. Alternative 3 which opens these areas up during the fall (when most damage is done) does nothing the mitigate the problem. Further, during the fall the use of ATVs on these road expands the use of bait. Baiting has caused major changes in deer movements an populations and has significantly changed the way we are now forced to hunt. It has caused "privatization" of areas of national forest where these baits are set. These impacts are very evident along the grades that extend off of Spring Brook and Mineral Lake Roads in the Great Divide unit. "Road closed beyond this point" signs last only a day or 2 with significant travel beyond. Again, I fully support Alternative 2.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concerns.
542-1	**Comment:** *In the Road Analysis Report at the bottom of page 4-21, there is a statement in quotations that states that according to WDNR data, participation for ATV in Wisconsin has risen 4-5% each year and that usage projections for the near future predict double-digit increases. No citation is provided for this quote nor is there any WDNR study listed in your literature citations in Chapter 6. Could you please provide a citation for this data and a report on how that data was collected?* **Response**: Thank you for this question. The statement the commenter is referring to has been referenced in several Forest Service documents. The initial reference or citation is Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS) All-Terrain and Off-Road Vehicles, 2004, Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest (CNNF) Plan project record. This is followed by a direct citation in the 2004, CNNF FEIS Appendices A-P, page B-6 and 2004, CNNF FEIS, page 3-235; Finally one is directed to the original Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) citation which is, WDNR, 2002, Riding all-terrain vehicles in Wisconsin: Results of 1999-2000 survey of ATV riders. PUB-SS-959 2002. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Madison, WI.
543-1	**Comment:** *Please add Forest Roads 131 & 132 as open to ATV travel routes to allow use of already existing major motor vehicle East/West and North/South roads for reasonable ATV access to the Forest, and connecting to already adjoining approved ATV trails.* **Response:** We appreciate your road-specific comment. FR 131 and FR 132 are town roads and considered outside the scope of the project. Local towns where the roads are located have the authority to designate mixed motorized use on these roads. Please contact the town for the designated use on these roads.
544-1	**Comment:** *I appreciate the opportunity to comment. I know that the CNNF and other Forests are not funded as well as they would like and that makes a project like this very challenging to complete in the time assigned. However this is the 3rd major road effort that the CNNF has undertaken since 1990. There does not appear to be a significant coordination of information from them. For instance we showed a map from the CNNF dated 1993 that included more roads than the maps provided with this project and the CNNF employees said they had not seen it.*

	Response: We will continue to gather and assess site-specific road information as we further implement the Forest Plan. Data has been stored in many forms over the years. We are in the process of converting this data into a new database system on all known roads. The new system is fairly data intensive and will take time to continue to populate as more current, up to date information is gather and verified.
544-2	**Comment:** *Instead in this case the burden of management is being put on the public. Again the "Daily Press" article says the "...the CNNF staff simply was unable to examine all (9,000 miles...". "So, if an individual asked for a particular forest road to be open, agency staff would then weigh the public value..." and make a decision. This is backwards. The Forest Service is charged with managing the Forests and has many professional people who have led the 2 previous roads projects and who should be leading this one by getting into the field, inventorying the roads and their conditions and making road by road proposals to the public to react to via comments. Not the public making proposals and the CNNF reacting to them.* **Response:** It is not reasonable to put all of the unauthorized roads on the map for use without field data collection and validation. We intend to continue to collect and assess roads across the Forest for both long-term administrative needs as well as public access. This is a process that will take time. In the meantime, the intent of this effort was to provide the public an opportunity in the short term to have roads considered for placement on the MVUM. The roads that are brought to our attention have been and will continue to be assessed through the RAP.
544-3	**Comment:** *I favor Alternative One until the CNNF does a quality job of inventorying the road system (after the FS publishes a reasonable definition of a road, not something 50 inches wide) and defines the condition of the roads, where there are problems, the specifics of the problems and whether or not it would be reasonable to make corrections vs closing. Until the Forest recognizes the importance of the road system to the public, including old logging roads, both socially and economically by doing quality studies of their uses. Until the CNNF recognizes the importance of the roads to people who like to hunt, drive for pleasure, etc. and are physically limited.* **Response:** We will continue to involve the public as we develop, implement, and update the MVUM. Please see response to comment 181-2, 201-2, and 284-5.
544-4	**Comment:** *I have personally checked the use of the Rainbow Wilderness and the Star Lake Non-motorized 2 times a week (midday/one weekend day/one week day) for use during the time between the end of the rifle deer season until spring thaw for several years. During the 8 years we owned Bear Country Sporting Goods I trapped minnows every week in an area of about 25 miles radius of Drummond. During the time we owned the store I ran marathons and covered miles and miles of roads and trails within 20 miles of Drummond 12 months a year. From these many hours of observations I saw people using a wide variety of road types. The good roads were used year around if plowed and sometimes by snowmobiles if they weren't. The low standard roads were used by hunters from mid-August until the end of hunting if there was not too much snow. There were a variety of uses on these roads such as berry picking, trapping, bike riding, wood cutting, hiking, fishing, etc.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your observations. They are important. We recognize that roads are used differently

	depending on the activity people are engaged in. It is important to provide a balance of access types which we believe is reflected in the decision and will continue to be a part of the annual update process.
544-5	**Comment:** *The USFS repeatedly uses lack of maintenance funding as a major reason for closing roads. I've lived here since 1990 and can point to 3 maintenance projects the CNNF has completed. I have talked to several people who have lived here a lot longer than I and who are active outdoors. One person can remember a grader on Bearsdale Road for a day or 2 long ago. One other person can remember one of the 3 projects that I noted and that over 20 years ago the CNNF did do some maintenance work annually. Most of the work done now is by loggers when they have a sale. The 60+ towns do the vast majority of the maintenance on most significant forest roads and have for years. The low standard roads have received virtually no maintenance, other than the public removing downed trees, and yet most of them are good enough to drive for the variety of activities that they are used for. Maintenance is being used as a reason for closing roads when to do so is not justified.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Although you may have seen this statement elsewhere, we have not presented lack of maintenance funding as a rationale on this project for eliminating use on any road. The factors used to evaluate roads in this project are the resource risks of water quality; soils; heritage resources; threatened, endangered and sensitive species habitats; and the potential to spread invasive species. Other factors used to evaluate roads are the values of recreation, private access and administrative access. Please see the Roads Analysis Process (RAP) Report for a more detailed discussion. Most of the roads that are not included for public motorized use are low standard roads. We acknowledge that we typically do not spend maintenance funding on low standard roads. Maintenance funding is focused on higher standard roads.
544-6	**Comment:** *The following are both some additional comments and some that relate to comments included in the other letters from the past that I have included as part of these comments.* **Response:** See below for responses.
544-7	**Comment:** *The 8/11/08 article in the Daily Press quotes the CNNF saying "…the vast majority" of these roads are already condisered unauthorized by the Forest Service.." The vast majority of these roads were created by the CNNF for a management purpose, not by other people. As such they were 'authorized ' by the Forest Service. After they were created they were used by the public for a variety of purposes as many of them continue to be used today. The same article states that 2 public comment period were held in each of 2006 and 2007. It seems clear that the Forest Service has virtually gotten away from one to one contact on a large scale to communicated with especially local people, as they formerly did, and now primarily relies on holding a few public meetings from which people are expected to be able to make quality comments. The language of the Forest Service is complx and few people that I know locally can read the Forest Plan and project NEPA and supporting documents that reference the Plan and understand them well enough to make substantial comments. The public sessions are not designed to help the situation They are relatively short and are few in number. The glass half full vs empty does not make any sense to people I have talked to. How doe removing 93% or 90% of the roads represent a glass half full? I (and others) do not understand the Daily Press quote of 'one agency official' who told a group that the CNNF could not ...'examine all 9,000 miles of road stretched out along 22,000 roads.." How do the 2,702 miles, 9,000 miles and 22,000 road fit together? The Daily press article also states*

	that ..'with 3 years to update the travel management rule..." This is just not the case. The CNNF made a major effort to locate and document all of the roads on the Forest in the early 1990's. There was an abundance of blue plastic ribbon marking roads of all levels. The CNNF people putting up the ribbon said they were finding and documenting all of the roads and the ribbon was there to tell other crews that I had been located and walked. When I was on the Bayfield County Board and the Wisconsin Counties Forest Association we asked the CNNF several times for the map that resulted from these field surveys. The CNNF answer each time was that they were not finished preparing it because there were some field errors that needed correcting. We finally did receive a map with the verbal caveat that all the errors were not yet corrected. No final map was ever made available. In 1999 the Forest Serviced "Roads Analysis: Informing Decisions about Managing the National Forest Transportation System'. The Forests were charged with completing a forest-scale analysis complete by 1/13/03, and it was finished by the CNNF. The report documents that driving on Forest roads is the biggest recreational use and that many of the people are driving on the old logging roads. It further says these roads are 'unsafe', 'damaging the environment' and are 'not maintained'. Please produce the accident records for these roads that shows the number and severity of the accidents that have happened in the last 10 years. Please produce the field surveys that document the locations where there has been environmental damage, the specific damages and the extent of the damaged areas. The early 1990's field road review, the 2003 analysis and the current 3 year program surely has collected a large amount of road specific data that can be used. None of the 3 CNNF major roads efforts has contained a high quality social or economic analysis **Response:** Thank you for your detailed comments. You are correct in that these roads may have been authorized by the Forest Service for administrative use at their initiation; however, they were not considered needed for long-term use and were not added to the road system. These roads have not been maintained and were not recorded or tracked when they were constructed for use. In addition, some of these roads were created by users. It is important that each of these roads is evaluated before a site-specific decision is made about each road's long term fate. We will continue with this effort as we implement the 2004 Forest Plan. In the meantime, we are focused on providing an adequate network of roads and trails for public motorized vehicle access. It is important we understand which of these roads are important for their use. Public meetings are an appropriate avenue for public response. At the public meetings people that were interested in a specific area were offered maps that were at a larger scale (so they could fill in any roads that they knew of that may have been missed by our efforts) in order to assist them in making comments. Very few roads have been brought forth as not being shown on the maps during the 2-year period that the Forest Service has been asking for input into the process. We are committed to meeting with people and groups who are interested in more one-on-one opportunities for discussion and input. We continue to welcome invitations to meet with people and groups. We encourage people to bring forth any roads that are being used by Forest visitors that may have been missed on the maps so they can be evaluated for access opportunities. The original information gathering effort for the unauthorized roads was done starting around 1998. This was achieved by going down each main road collecting all the side roads that intersected, that were drivable with an ATV. This effort was focused on obtaining ATV use information due to the increase in ATV use on the Forest. The original inventory was quite accurate, though

	not 100%. Many of these unauthorized roads at that time were not drivable by vehicles without some clearing needed. Since that time (10 years later) many of these roads continue to be more overgrown. Since the original field verification there have been other actions taken to further verify road locations on the ground, including recreation staff ground reconnaissance, timber sale activities reconnaissance, and engineering reconnaissance in preparation for large scale projects designed to implement the Forest Plan. Roads within these project areas were assessed for present and future needs. Site-specific decisions were incorporated into these projects to determine the plan for each road. The Forest Scale roads analysis completed in 2003 did not require inclusion of unauthorized roads or the low standard system roads. This effort only included the passenger car roads.
544-8	**Comment:** *I asked a series of questions in my previous comments and have not received any reply to them. I would appreciate it very much if you would look at them and give me your responses.* **Response:** See below for responses.
544-9	**Comment:** *ENC: A map showing an example of roads that I believe need to be kept open. It is not possible to go to all of the road locations that a person uses over a 2 or 3 year period, do the analysis work and submit recommendations to the CNNF. This is what the CNNF should be doing and presenting their findings and recommendations for public comment.* **Response:** We will continue to assess roads on a site-specific basis as we continue to implement the Forest Plan. These site-specific decisions will be incorporated into future updates of the map.
544-10	**Comment:** *Letter 151 submitted during scoping comment period. All comments entered in the database on 11/26/07.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your previous comments. These comments were received prior to completing our analysis. We believe most of your questions and concerns have been addressed in our analysis. Please see the EA and associated resource reports.
544-11	**Comment:** *Comments submitted 1/27/07 during earlier TMR process (reviewed and analyzed by contractors)* **Response:** We heard from many people on both sides of the motorized issue. Some prefer a non-motorized experience while others prefer a motorized experience. It is important we provide an appropriate balance of access for all users. .We believe our decision serves both needs by providing this balance. We understand your concerns and ask you to work with us to more specifically define your needs within the Forest. Also note that wolves were not a reason for making any road unavailable for motorized use. Additionally, administrative access for activities such as timber harvesting and fire suppression is not dependent of public motorized access; we have a network of roads to serve these administrative needs. Please also see response to comment 180-1 for a discussion on access for disabled persons.
544-12	**Comment:** *Comments prepared in response to the draft Forest Level Roads Analysis (2003).*

	Response: Thank you for sharing additional copies of previous input.
545-1	**Comment:** *I strongly support and laud your efforts to reduce the motorized impact on these two overused forests that already have an excess of private in-holdings and recreation homes. Our forests, especially those in Wisconsin, have become so fractured by roads and trails, that neo-tropical, ground nesting birds and large predators are being deprived of habitat. It is ecologically very important that we reestablish larger blocks of forest into un-fragmented landscape scale parcels.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
545-2	**Comment:** *As a retired ecologist (UW-O, Dept. of Biology), I am deeply troubled by the rapid encroachment of invasive and exotic species into the Wisconsin and national landscapes. This rapid encroachment is largely facilitated by off-road highway vehicles and ATVs. Each motorized trail into the forest is like a dirty hypodermic syringe injecting invasive exotics into the forest where they displace the native ground cover and tree seedlings. Once in the forest or enclosed wetlands, their removal is very expensive and nearly impossible. Garlic mustard is of special concern because it is one of the very few exotics that colonizes the ground layer of closed-canopy, mature forests. It quickly displaces the ground layer of native plants and seedlings while injecting toxic compounds into the soil that kill the mycorrhizal fungi. These soil fungi are absolutely essential for the growth and even survival of the forest tress themselves. Garlic mustard is spreading rapidly northward in Wisconsin from the heavily infested forests of the Kettle Moraine area and from farm woodlands where ATVs and off-road recreation vehicles have played a major role in redistributing this exotic.* **Response:** You are so right. The TMR project includes weeds as an issue in the analysis which states that roads open to vehicular use are at higher risk for introduction and spread of weeds than those that are closed. Some roads in this project were made unavailable to motorized use because of the weed issue. The CNNF initiated a Non-native Invasive Species strategy over 10 years ago which identifies 20 high risk invasive plants (garlic mustard ranks very high risk). Surveys are conducted every year at sites at high risk, including trails and roads. Treatments include herbicide, burning, mowing and hand-pulling. The commenter can refer to the NNIS Specialist Report in the TMR EA and go online and review the Non-native Invasive Species Project EA on the left side of our web page at: (http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/cnnf/). I also invite the commenter to contact the Forest Ecologist (715-762-5169) and find out how to be active in our Weed Cooperatives (some of our best volunteers are retirees!).
546-1	**Comment:** *Thank you for the consideration that your agency is given to expand the ATV trail system in this national forest area south of Mountain, Wisconsin. Extending trail 2308BC as an ATV trail would have no or minimal impact to the current forest trail and the environment that exists today. My wife Carol and I are the owners of the Mountain Springs Motel, located at the junction of State Hwy 32 and 64. The current snowmobile trail 2308BC has crossed the Motel property for the last 35 years. The trail is an asset to our existence. By allowing ATV access to these trails would allow trail riders access to lodging, fuel and other amenities. We will assure you by opening this trail that you have made the right choice.* **Response:** Thank you for submitting your road-specific comment. This is the best way for us to address your access needs and interests. FR 2308BC was reviewed and designated for HLV and ATV in the selected alternative. This road, as well as FR

	2308B, and FR 2308BD have been designated for ATV use.
547-1	**Comment:** *I returned Brenda's phone call to listen to her comments on this project. Brenda shared with me that she was in full support of the proposed road closures. She had read an article in the local Sheboygan newspaper, which appeared to be an abbreviated article from the one that was published in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel. The Sheboygan newspaper did not have much information with the forest's proposal and she was looking for more information. I described the project's history, how we got to this point with the 30-day comment period, and how we planned to proceed with the Motor Vehicle Use Map's publication. Brenda said that she and her husband hunt on the east side of the forest and desire a hunting experience without any motorized noise. They use mostly "walk in" roads. They both are encountering more hunters each year, some who don't follow the rules, making Brenda's and her husband's experience not as enjoyable. Some of these hunters take motor vehicles where they don't belong. They're finding that they have to move further away for their desired hunting experience. Both of them desire a walking experience and appreciate this project's objectives to eliminate motorized use on many of the forest's roads. Brenda did not have any specific comments on which roads should be considered/evaluated for closure. I told her that she could get more information from our website (http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/cnnf/rec/tmr/index.html). She requested to be added to the project's mailing list.* **Response:** Thank you for calling and sharing your hunting experiences and preferences with us. You have been added to our mailing list.
548-1	**Comment:** *Supports closing roads.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; others expressed a similar comment. Please see response to comment 185-1.
549-1	**Comment:** *Bill is opposed to closing any roads. He feels that the more legislation we have, the worse it is for all of us.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; also see response to letter 181-3.
550-1	**Comment:** *Voice mail comments received on 8-18-2008, 4:45pm on the front desk voice mail: Larry is concerned about the proposal that would close additional roads in the Nicolet National Forest. Expressed concerns about limiting access for many people and it's not right that people would be restricted from using the Forest in this way.* **Response:** Thank you for your voice mail. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are implementing this project. We believe that our decision provides a balance to meet everyone's access needs while minimizing the environmental impacts. Our decision also provides for a responsible method to expand our network of roads and trails for motorized use and you are encouraged to stay engaged in our future updates to the MVUM.
550-2	**Comment:** *Returned Larry's call on 8-19-2008, 9:45 am. Larry is not happy with either Alt 2 or 3. He spends a lot of time in the Forest. Alt 2 or 3 will concentrate travel on what's left. This will restrict access for those who can't walk a long way - kids, older people and handicapped people. He is baffled on the need to restrict access. Doesn't agree with the process of burdening the public with suggesting roads to remain open. He doesn't think we should or need to close any roads. They will close on their*

	own. This will also restrict snowmobile access. He believes Alt 1 is the only solution and hopes that it is a viable option. **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comments 181-3 and 260-1. Mapping of all roads and trails in Alternative 1 may create confusion for Forest users on which roads are actually available for use. As you state, a number of these roads are overgrown by vegetation. To suggest these roads would be available to use is inaccurate and contrary to my responsibilities as a manager of your Forest. Additionally, if roads are overgrown or inaccessible, those roads are not being used by the public. Our process asked the public to let us know which roads they use.
552-1	**Comment:** *I have had both of my knees replaced (totally). I have had 3 discs removed from my back. I can not walk very far and if you close any more of "our roads" there is a lot of great things I will never be able to show them. I support alternative 1. Me and a lot of my dear friends will not get to see and enjoy the lovely Northwoods again.* **Response:** We support your enjoyment and use of the forest. We welcome people of all abilities. We believe our decision provides adequate motorized access. There will continue to be 6,800 miles of roads accessing the Forest. Please let us know specifically which roads you use to access the Forest and we will consider them in our annual map update. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are implementing this project.
553-1	**Comment:** Duplicate letter to comment letter 445. **Response:** Please see response to comments 445-1–5.
554-1	**Comment:** *The Board of Directors of the 400 member Taylor County Sportsman's Club would like to go on record in opposition of the travel management plan being proposed for the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest. The National Forests were created for the enjoyment of the public. This effort being proposed will essentially exclude more people from the access needed to enjoy the forests. Instead of closing off more areas, the USFS should be developing ways to make the National Forest more accessible for hunting, fishing, kinking and other outdoor recreational pursuits.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are implementing this project and 201-2 for information on the Forest Service mission. Please also note that this is an on-going project and we will continually accept specific comments from the public for consideration in our annual updates to the motor vehicle use map. We want to know what's important to you. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
555-1	**Comment:** *As a business owner, landowner, and user of the national forest, I am writing to you in opposition of the travel management project. I feel this would limit access to large areas of the forest to a lot of people. There are already large areas of the forest set aside for non-motorized use, and through my own experience I know they are not used fully. The national forest system is for the people and the taxpayers. Please do not shut these people off.* **Response:** We recognize that motorized recreation is controversial in Wisconsin (see Recreation report). Some people would like more motorized recreation opportunities while other people would like more non-motorized recreation opportunities. We

	believe our decision provides for a balance between motorized and non-motorized access in a sustainable way. We will continue to monitor recreation, motorized use, and associated impacts to surrounding economies. Also see response to comment 201-2 for Forest Service mission.
556-1	**Comment:** *My preference is alternative 1. On closing of roads in the national forests - I paid taxes on these lands - I should be able to drive on the roads.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comments 181-1, 201-2, and 241-1.
557-1	**Comment:** *Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the 2009 Motor Vehicle Use Map. Many of us support very strongly the proposal to close more than 50 percent of roads in the National Forest. We don't need the roads and as has been said: there is too much access now to the forest and often present access is resented because of the noise, the smoke, and sometimes the garbage left for hikers to pick up. I understand that the ATV lobby is strong and persuasive but as these roads continue they will be expanded over time. It has happened that way in many places. Even the village of Winter has witnessed such a change because the ATV lobby is more aggressive - some say hostile - to those in the community who don't have the stamina or want another fight.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Others expressed similar comments. Please see response to comment 185-1 for an explanation of why we are implementing this project and a description of our decision.
558-1	**Comment:** *My wife and I write to support the creation of non-motorized section of our Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest. As our nation expands into more remote areas, as our recreation becomes further removed from the soil that makes up the Earth, we need to make an effort to create room for what is natural and threatened by our human urge to take over every thing. These are forces that seek the instant pleasure of speed and power; there are lobbies that promote their short term goals of profit over what is the best stewardship of our natural heritage. Supervisor Higgins, please continue to pursue the creation of non-motorized section of our Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest to preserve the best stewardship in our national forests.* **Response**: Thank you for your perspective. We believe our decision provides for a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation. We have an array of wilderness and semi-primitive non-motorized areas on the Forest for those who enjoy a non-motorized experience.
559-1	**Comment:** *I find it hard to believe there is a possibility of closing some roads that people still do use. And, to maybe open them only for deer hunting. The ATVers using the roads are doing very little damage in most cases - my son rides and has been out in the barrens since his Grampa took him as a little boy - what is the real problem here? Closing some roads is really stupid.* **Response:** Thank you for your input. Many of the roads that will be unavailable for motorized use in our decision are roads that are only accessible by four wheel drive vehicles or are not accessible at all. We believe our decision will still provide access for all. Also, please note that ATV access in the decision increased by 71 miles of road and 18 miles of ATV trail. Please see response to comment 181-3 and the environmental assessment for a description of the environmental consequences associated

	with motorized use.
559-2	**Comment:** *I certainly hope all consideration is given before this decision is made. Thanks for giving me the chance to let you know how an elderly lady feels.* **Response:** In the process of decision making for this and all projects on the forest, we consider all impacts in addition to taking into consideration all public comments such as yours. Thank you for your review and comments.
560-1	**Comment:** *This letter is in regards to the travel management project on the Chequamegon-Nicolet NF. As a hunter and fisherman who regularly uses the Nicolet portion of the NF I would like to express my support for Alternative 2 of the forest proposals. I have seen the tremendous increase in use of the national forest over the past 3 decades. Many of the areas that at one time seen had little vehicle traffic during the hunting season are now extremely heavily used by vehicles. This vehicle traffic makes hunting difficult and greatly reduces the quality of the hunt. Although there are some roads that are closed to motor vehicle traffic there are relatively few areas that are large in size. By closing some of the roads proposed in Alternative 2 this will provide better opportunities for this type of hunting experience. Some hunters may say that having all of the roads open to motor vehicles improves their access and their hunting but what most often happens is the increase in motor vehicle traffic drives the deer further from the roads, disrupts their normal movement and makes them more nocturnal. We have found better hunting and a better quality experience by hunting those areas which are closed to motor vehicles. I have found that older hunters that hunt these same areas hunt near a trail and still have a quality hunt. These hunters have a good trail to walk on without worrying if someone is going to park a vehicle close to their stand site. Judging by the large amount of use these closed to motor vehicles areas during the hunting season they are well liked by a large number of hunters (continued in comment -2).* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your hunting experience. Our decision provides roads that will be unavailable to motorized use, which provides areas for those seeking a non-motorized hunting experience. Additionally, the decision also allows increased access during the fall hunting season. Continued management of the deer herd is important to maintain the health of the Forest as well as support an important part of our heritage.
560-2	**Comment:** *(continued from cmt. no 1) Further, even if Alternative 2 would be implemented, the amount of roads that will remain open to motor vehicles will still vastly outnumber the miles of closed roads. Those hunters who want to park near their hunting site will still have hundreds of miles of open roads to drive down. I believe some groups are incorrectly trying to portray Alternatives 2 and 3 as closing the majority of roads on the national forest.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. The decision will initially include 2,363 miles of road available for public motor vehicle use (HLVs and ATVs) on the forest. The decision will also designate 334 miles of trails to be available for public ATV use. As an additional note the decision only includes those roads that are under sole Forest Service jurisdiction. Approximately 4,500 miles of town, county and state roads also provide access to the National Forest.
560-3	**Comment:** *Although Alternative 3 closes more miles of roads to motor vehicles the inclusion of some roads being open for "fall highway legal" vehicle use will lead to more confusion and people wondering why they can only use a road for a certain time of*

	the year. For clarity and enforcement purposes closing roads to motor vehicle use year round is much easier to implement and enforce. **Response:** Implementing the same system of roads available for public motorized use year-round may be less confusing to the public and "easier" for law enforcement officials; however, we are aware that many people using the CNNF enjoy motorized recreation and would like additional motorized access during hunting seasons.
561-1	**Comment:** *I feel that all of the forest roads should remain open. During deer hunting they are all being used. It will make hunting more dangerous because people are going to hunt closer together. This will also cause less people to hunt which will cause there to be less tourism during deer season.* **Response:** Thank you for your input and concern. Please see response to comment 217-1 for a discussion on motorized hunting.
562-1	**Comment:** *In regards to the Forest Plan currently under question, I would like to see the Alternative 1 Plan put into action. The forest (Lakewood landbase) has been a huge part of my life since my grandfather began taking me into the woods as a young child. I am now 49 years old. The majority of the roads that would be closed to vehicles and recreation are roads that my grandfather took me on and are the same roads that I take my children on for the past 20 years. Being able to have access to the forest has allowed me to appreciate the beauty of nature and wildlife. It is also a great source of enjoyment by providing means for hunting, fishing, mountain biking, cross country skiing, snowmobiling, and motorcycling. Being able to explore parts of our national forest has given me a greater appreciation for nature.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; we appreciate your life long use of the Forest. Your continued use of the Forest is important to us. Others felt the same; please see response to comment 181-3. Also note that this is not the end of the project. The motor vehicle use map that we publish in January 2009 will be updated annually. Please let us know which specifically which roads you use and we will consider them in our annual update. The more specific you can be the better we can address your access needs.
562-2	**Comment:** *Not only am I concerned about losing something I greatly value, but I also fear that closing these roads could lead to future problems. In the case of a forest fire, it is crucial that action be taken as quickly as possible. The roads proposed to e closed could be very valuable in a situation as this because it allows greater access to a larger area of the forest. It would allow firefighters to act quicker and help save as much of the forest as possible.* **Response:** Thank you for fire suppression concern. The outcome of the Travel Management Rule is a designated network of roads and trails for public motorized use. This network is only a portion of our entire transportation system. Administrative access, such as timber harvesting, fire response, etc., is not dependent on public motorized access and is outside the scope of the analysis. Please be assured that the Forest Service and other emergency agencies will have the ability to access the Forest where needed to conduct forest management activities or fire suppression actions.

562-3	**Comment:** *If the Alternative 1 plan is an unrealistic goal, in my opinion, the Alternative 3 plan would be the next best choice. Allowing the roads to be open for part of the year is still better than nothing. The only suggestion I have that could help better the Alternative 3 plan would be to have the roads closed in early spring then open them in late spring/early summer. At that time, the frost will be gone by then and also the rainy season which together, would cut back greatly on erosion. It would also allow people maximum time to enjoy recreational sports in the forest.* **Response:** In our decision we selected a modified Alternative 3. In our decision we added 205 miles of roads a open to motor vehicle use and we added 18 miles of ATV trail. We also included a fall access season from September 1 to December 31 to accommodate the fall hunting and gathering seasons. Please see the Decision Notice for a complete description of our decision.
563-1	**Comment:** *We as a club wish to go with Alt. 1. We ask you not to close these Maintained/Non maintained "connector" trails to motorized recreational vehicles. We as a community survive on the tourism with the winters getter shorter, we struggle to support our families, we need to create new activities to draw the tourists to our communities. These various maintained/ non maintained "connector" trails connect us to various other trails which are used by snowmobiles and someday , hopefully, ATV's. If your decision is to close these trails we hope you would consider our input on creating new trails that everyone can enjoy and we'd be more than willing to work with you on creating these trails.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and concerns. Please see response to comment 181-3 and Appendix A for economics. We look forward to working with clubs such as yours in the future and encourage you to submit additions or deletions to the MVUM. Please note that snowmobile trails are unaffected by this project. The creation of new trails however, would be proposed and completed by each individual Ranger District. We encourage you to work with the specific district office.
564-1	**Comment:** *I am writing on behalf of WOHVA (Wisconsin Off-Highway Vehicle Association) to express our support for Alternative 1 (No Action) in your recently released Environmental Assessment- Travel Management Project.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 181-3 for a discussion of why we are implementing this project and a brief of our decision.
564-2	**Comment:** *However, the Forest Service proposal (Alternative 2) would result in the closure of over 2500 miles of roads in the Wisconsin Forests. That's 55% of your inventoried roads. For that reason alone WOHVA must support Alternative 1.* **Response:** In our decision we added approximately 205 additional miles of roads to our travel system, which equates to a 49% reduction of the miles of roads under sole Forest Service jurisdiction. These roads are only part the total miles of roads accessing the Forest. The towns, counties, and the State have jurisdiction over approximately half of the roads accessing the Forest. The 49% of miles of sole Forest Service jurisdiction roads equates to 25% of total miles of roads on the Forest. There will be a total of approximately 6,800 miles of roads under all jurisdictions accessing the Forest. Most of the roads that will be unavailable for motorized use are unauthorized roads, which are not part of the current travel system. Many of these roads are only accessible by high clearance vehicles or not accessible at all. Additionally, the number of miles of ATV trails increased by 16 miles on the west side of the Forest. We encourage your participation in providing input to the MVUM as it is updated each year.

	The more specific the feedback, the better we can accommodate your needs and interests..
564-3	**Comment:** *WOHVA believes that your original inventory of roads was terribly low and did not accurately include all roads/trails used by motorized recreationists in the Forests. This increases the difficulty of motorized recreationists in submitting comments to the Forest Service which you would have found useful in actually locating routes on Forest Service property. As a result, many roads used for decades by hunting, fishing, gathering and OHV recreating enthusiasts never showed up on your inventory. WOHVA requests that you go back to that point in the project and solicit input from users to refine a more accurate and complete inventory of roads.* **Response:** Road inventories for use in this project has spanned information gathering from 1998 to present. The process of these inventories was achieved by inventorying each main road and all the side roads that intersected. Our original inventory was quite accurate, though not 100%. Many of these unauthorized roads that were gathered at that time were not drivable by vehicles without some clearing needed. Since that time (ten years later) many of these roads continue to be more overgrown. Since the original field verification there have been other actions taken to further verify road locations on the ground, including recreation staff ground reconnaissance, timber sale activities reconnaissance, and engineering reconnaissance for large scale projects were road field reconnaissance is essential for knowledge of what is actually on the ground for administrative and contract access, both for present and future needs. At the public meetings people that were interested in a specific area were offered maps that were at a larger scale, (so they could fill in any roads that they knew of that may have been missed by our efforts) in order to assist them in making comments. We encourage all your members to participate in the submission of roads for inclusion in the annual MVUM update.
564-4	**Comment:** *WOHVA suggests also, that the Forest Service did not explore all possible sources of funding or assets in what seems to be having been a premature and arbitrary decision to close the majority of roads early on in the project. WOHVA urges the Forest Service to explore additional funding sources such as user fee's and vehicle registrations. We also urge the Forest Service to be much more active in exploring the possibility of having recreational groups/organizations adopt sections of the roads and trails. Additionally, WOHVA encourages the Forest Service to create a category of roads which would be accessible to "travel at your own risk". This would allow the Forest Service to no longer service or maintain these routes, while still allowing the routes to be open by those willing our eager to travel extremely rustic routes.* **Response:** We agree with your ideas on partnership and maintenance. We would be happy to assist in a start-up discussion with a partnership organization. Groups that have funded projects on the Forest generally operate with very little Forest oversight and are chartered self-sustaining organizations. The opportunity to "no longer service or maintain" routes and post as travel at your own risk may not meet other objectives of the National Forest System such as protection of wetlands and wildlife. Over time there have been unacceptable soil and erosion conditions. The opportunity to charge a fee for motorized trails is a possibility which the Forest has chosen not to enact at this time since the State manages an ATV vehicle registration fee. Through partnership with the State, the Forest receives a portion of these funds through grants for specific work on specific motorized trails

566-1	**Comment:** *I live 400 ft. from the Blackjack Wilderness Area. My property across the street abuts the area and I use it on a limited basis. The designated hiking trails and old Forest Service roads are great for hiking but the vast majority of the Wilderness area is, to most people, inaccessible. I understand the need for old growth, wilderness areas and consider our area blessed with the Blackjack, Headwaters, and Whisker Lake Wilderness areas. I believe the proposals for closing more roads would create more areas that would be inaccessible for the vast majority of forest users.* **Response:** Thank you for your appreciation of the wilderness areas. We believe our decision provides for a balance between motorized and non-motorized access and still provides plenty of roads for public motorized access. In addition, our decision includes an adaptive management process that provides the public an opportunity to continually suggest roads for inclusion or deletion on the MVUM. This process we ask the public to be specific about which roads they are important to them. That way we can be the most responsive to the public's needs. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of this process.
566-2	**Comment:** *I do laud your ATV No Action alternative plan. People in the county have voted how they feel about ATV use in our area.* **Response:** We encourage you and all county residents to provide road-specific comments for inclusion in the annual updates to the MVUM. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of this process. Please also see response to comment 181-3 for why we are implementing this project.
566-3	**Comment:** *In closing, please, please, please, don't close the forest down to our access. I believe the National Forest System was established for the benefit of the public to use and enjoy.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. As land managers, we take our Agency's mission very seriously, especially when it pertains to sustaining the health, diversity, and productivity of this Forest to meet the needs of present and future generations Please see response to comments 181-3, 201-1, and 241-1.
567-1	**Comment:** *I agree with Alternative 1. For the reason highway legal vehicles should have access to the forest. No road should be closed that are now open. A lot of us are too old to walk in. They should be left open for wood cutting, berry picking, hunting, and fishing. No road to a lake should be closed.* **Response:** Thank you for your input. Others feel the same; please see response to comment 181-3 and 260-1.
567-2	**Comment:** *I disagree with ATVs on forest roads. The roads are too narrow (only one lane). ATVs can travel at greater speeds on forest roads than HLV. ATVs are smaller and harder to see. No forest road that dead ends should be open to ATV travel. There is no parking for them to unload or they will travel on roads not open to them to get there. There is not enough law enforcement to enforce ATV laws. People who travel on forest roads with HLV will keep them open, like down trees. ATVs will just drive around them, making a new trail and eroding the forest.* **Response:** We recognize ATV use as a legitimate use of National Forest System lands under direction mandated the Multiple

	Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960**.** To some Forest users, dead end roads provide valuable access for hunting, dispersed camping, firewood gathering and bough gathering. As land managers we need to balance the needs of all people and their desired use of the Forest. Please see response to letter 181-3 for an explanation of why this project is necessary. .
567-3	**Comment:** *I would like to see Forest Road 1808 closed to ATV travel. It is in the Drummond district south of Pigeon Lake T44N R8W, section 4. 1808 is a dead end road. It is too narrow for ATV and HLV. There is no parking for access to the road. Please consider this now or in the future. I would like to thank all the forestry people for all of the work that they have put into this project.* **Response**: Thank you for your comment. This road is designated for hlv in the selected alternative. The road is in fact passable and provides the only direct access to Shurenburg Springs impoundment for recreation (fishing).
568-1	**Comment:** *Our opposition to the proposed alternatives is based on the impacts of the closure on public access to a public resource. The thousands of miles of "woods roads" originally created during logging in the last century are well used by the public for access to: trout streams; unnamed potholes for waterfowl hunting; wild berry harvest; trapping; timber harvest; fire protection/suppression; upland game hunting; and big game hunting (including deer, bear and eventually elk). The TMP would severely impact these hunting and other recreational opportunities.* **Response:** Thank you for expressing your concerns; others also expressed similar concerns. Please see response to comment 181-3 for and explanation of why we are implementing this project and changes are being made. Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the national forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6,800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Please also note that this project is focused on public motor vehicle access. Our decision addresses motor vehicle use for the general public. This is distinctly different from motor vehicle use that is needed to manage the natural resources of the national forest. We term this type of use as “administrative.” Given our decision’s focus on general public use of motor vehicles, road access needed to manage an administrative us, such as fighting wildfires, will not be affected. Please note that most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered “unauthorized roads” – roads that we have not yet determined are necessary for the protection, administration or utilization of the Forest. However, our decision includes a process whereby the public will have the opportunity to continually comment on specific roads they would like considered for inclusion or deletion from the MVUM.
568-2	**Comment:** *Hunter recruitment and retention: According to the DNR, access to land is one of the primary reasons for a decline in hunter recruitment and retention. With the parcelization and posting of private lands, availability of public land becomes increasingly important. Considering federal lands make up a significant portion of the state's public land, initiatives to restrict access on any public properties, let alone the 1.5 million acres of National Forest seems ill-advised. Wisconsin hunters are not the only ones who recognize the importance of providing access for hunters. President Bush on August 17, 2007 issued a*

	Presidential Order, entitled Facilitation of Hunting and Wildlife Conservation, the WCC believes that the US Forest Service must address documented declining trends in hunting participation. Rather than "implementing actions that expand and enhance hunting opportunities for the public", the Forest Service via the TMP will actually decrease hunting opportunities, and is therefore indirect conflict with this Presidential Order. Considering "following executive direction" is one of the Forest Services' 13 guiding principles, we find this EA in direct conflict with not only the Executive Order, but your own agency's guiding principles. Sound game management: The Forest Service, as part of their mission advocates for "a conservation ethic in promoting the health, productivity, diversity, and beauty of the forests." A key component to achieving this goal is managing populations of white-tailed deer. Forest professionals and academics will concur that species diversity and forest regeneration are negatively affected by high deer populations. Restricting access to large expanses of forest will significantly hinder the Wisconsin's game managers, the hunters, from accessing these deer. (continued in comment -3) **Response:** The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We believe this continues to provide hunters ample access to hunt on the national forest. We have found no definitive conclusion with our research that a reduction in available roads adversely influences hunter success (for deer, bear, grouse, or turkey). However, our decision does not affect the hunting opportunity on the CNNF. With the exception of campgrounds and administrative sites, the vast majority of the CNNF will continue to be open to hunters. If there are desired roads that are not on the MVUM, people will continue to have opportunities to submit suggestions to us to add those roads for a map update. We have also consulted with the WDNR on game management issues, including those that relate to motorized access on the CNNF. We acknowledge that there are Deer Management Units on the CNNF that are under population goals, some are at goal, and others are above goal. It is recognized that one of the tools for managing the deer populations in Wisconsin is through hunting and that deer do affect tree regeneration, crop damage, and have other effects on the natural community. The roads available for motorized use with our decision could increase the average distance that a hunter would have to walk in or haul bait or a deer stand. However, this potential increase in travel distance is not expected to measurably affect the magnitude of impact that hunters have in determining the size of Wisconsin's deer population. If there are roads that are not on the MVUM, people will continue to have opportunities to submit suggestions to us to add those roads for a map update.
568-3	**Comment:** *(Continue from comment - 2) It might be argued that the TMP does not limit access to hunters, it only limits vehicle access. Vehicles extend the ability of each of us, as individuals to access the forest. For the very old, and the very young, restricted vehicle access will make much of the forest entirely inaccessible. Because the basic unit of most hunting parties is the family, eliminating the very old, and the very young will also eliminate access by the fit and prime members of the party. Hunting pressure, and therefore deer management in a huge part of the forest will be greatly reduced. The same will be true regarding management of other species, especially beaver.* **Response:** Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the

	national forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6,800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. We believe that this provides ample access for people who want to use motor vehicles while also accounting for those people who prefer a "walk-in" or non-motorized experience.
568-4	**Comment:** *Cost/Benefit Analysis?: It is not an issue of cost to taxpayers of the Forest Service to keep these roads open. The Forest Service does not maintain these roads. The users of these woods roads keep them open. Those not used by hunters, anglers, trappers, campers, sightseers, berry pickers and horseback riders quickly become overgrown with vegetation and are no longer visible. Did the Forest Service also take into consideration the thousands of Wisconsin citizens who gather downed firewood? These citizens pay $20 for a permit that allows the retrieval of about 4 logger's cords of wood. Berms and gates will prevent access to the wood, and it will go to waste. In this time of high fuel costs, many in the north depend on this resource. We did not see reference to this issue in the EA.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Our decision addresses motor vehicle use for the general public, as well as the general forest uses that are associated with this access. Many of the uses you cite are available to the general public without a permit. The selected alternative adds an additional 205 miles of roads and 16 miles of trails. One of the significant issues addressed in the EA was 'not enough motorized access.' The selected alternative specifically adds roads for fall access, which includes access for not only hunting, but also firewood and bough gathering. See EA pages 7 and 14-15. Please also see the Decision Notice page 2. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered "unauthorized roads" – roads that we have not yet determined are necessary for the protection, administration or utilization of the Forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people's need for that access. However, our decision does not authorize any physical closure of these unauthorized roads through a gate or berm. If deemed necessary, the local Forest Service official will propose such a closure and make a decision after involving the public in that decision. Please see comment 181-3 for reasons why adding these unauthorized roads without analysis would be irresponsible. Please note that our decision provides a process for the public to suggest roads for inclusion or deletion from the MVUM, which will be updated annually.
568-5	**Comment:** *Accessibility and Equality: Demographic data and research show that hunters in this state are aging, and so it the overall population in this state. We do not see this demographic trend addressed in you assessment. According to a recent Department of Natural Resources assessment of recreational needs, Wisconsin's population is aging. According to the report in a trend known as demographic transition, populations within the state have become markedly older than in previous generations. Aging across the state, however, has not been uniform. Populations in northern regions of the state are becoming older as young people migrate out a leave behind a population of primarily older residents. These same northern regions are also popular locations for retirement and, as more retirees migrate into them, the population demographics of these regions are becoming increasingly older. The proposed road closings will basically eliminate access into the forest by the very residents who reside near and would utilize the forest. This aging population will not be able to hike deep into the forest for consumptive or non-*

	recreational activity. And what of the mobility impaired? Should those who are unable to traverse the forest like most of us not be offered the same opportunity to enjoying their federal forest? What about the youth? On the US Forest Service website if promotes youth appreciation of our forests, "Forests are our friends," states Woodsy Owl. How are our children to learn appreciation for our forest without access to them? Who will take our children into the forests if access by aging members of our population is restricted? **Response:** We understand that many of our forest users are aging and not as capable to use the forest as they have in the past. Our decision will still provide approximately 6,800 miles of road for public motor vehicle use when you add in the roads under township, county, and State jurisdiction. We believe this provides ample access for people so they enjoy the outdoors on the national forest while also addressing the environmental impacts that arise from this use. Please see response to comment 180-1 for further explanation on how we addressed, and will continue to address, people with disabilities and their desire to use the national forest.
568-6	**Comment:** *One size does not fit all: We are not opposed to ALL road closures, in fact many closures may be exactly the kind of management decision we could support. For instance, some closings may benefit wildlife populations, for instance Elk reproduction in the Clam Lake area. Closing some roads in spring, during calving season, may be warranted, but during other times of the year these roads could remain open for access by outdoor recreationists. However, our impression of the proposed broad closures of thousands of miles seems to be an easy, knee jerk reaction, rather than a methodical, scientific approach where demographic data, resource management, economics, and public rights to a public resource receive equal consideration. Wisconsin's National Forests were created for multi-use and we, representing Wisconsin's natural resource users, believe that our rights to use these public lands have not been adequately considered in the environmental assessment.* **Response:** We understood from the beginning that we would need input from the public on how they use roads on the national forest. We have devoted almost two years to reaching out to people so we can hear their perspectives. Thus, public involvement has been a very important component in how we approached this project. We held 15 open houses in 2007 to solicit public input on specific roads. Ten open houses were held in January and February 2007, five for the public and five for governmental entities. Five open houses were held in October 2007 to present our initial proposal to the public and to solicit additional comments. The Decision Notice (pages 7-9) also describes the process the Forest Service used to inform and involve the public for this project. The significant issue of “not enough motorized access” related to people’s reaction to our initial proposal in October 2007. Alternative 3 was developed to accommodate the additional 59 miles of roads suggested to us. Our decision adds another 205 miles of road based on comments we received during the 30-day comment period. We will continually listen to people and accept specific information they have for roads and trails as we update the MVUM.
569-1	**Comment:** *I, along with five other family members own property at FN3130 on firelane 2176 that runs north and south along the east side of Kentuck Lake in the town of Phelps. Our family has been hunting and fishing this area for 63 years. We have twelve members of our family that use this area for recreation and the enjoyment of what nature offers. We look forward to passing this*

	tradition on for generations to come. **Response:** We appreciate the interest that multiple generations have in this national forest. We used this perspective to help us understand how to manage motor vehicle access today for the continued enjoyment of future generations. It is also this specific information we want people to share with us so we can effectively evaluate whether to designate a road or trail for motor vehicle use. We strongly encourage people to continually engage us and share their perspectives about access to the national forest with us.
569-2	**Comment:** *I don't understand why there is an issue involving the closing of some roads in this area. I've been told that two of the reasons are for wolf habitat and for the enjoyment of folks who like hiking in undisturbed forests. In regards to the wolf habitat, I have never seen a wolf in that area nor have I seen more than a half dozen people walking the woods without either a fishing pole or gun in their possession. Personally, I've hunted and fished this area for the past 48 years. I sincerely hope that this is not a movement being pursued by the Sierra Club or PETA.* **Response:** Thank you for your input and description of forest use in the area. While one of the outcomes of this project would be a reduction in the number of miles of open roads within wolf pack territories, it is not one of the purposes of this project. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are implementing this project.
569-3	**Comment:** *Why is there a problem with these roads? Other than spec roads they are not maintained by the Forest Service but by those of us who use them.* **Response:** The roads that are being made unavailable to motorized use in this project are what we term unauthorized roads. We have not determined there is a need for these roads for the protection, administration or utilization of the Forest. It is not reasonable to put all of the unauthorized roads on the map for use without field data collection and validation. These are roads that are partially, if not totally, grown in with vegetation and where public vehicle access is already severely limited. The outcome of this project will be a motor vehicle use map that will be published in January 2009. This map will be updated annually and the public will have the opportunity to provide road specific comments. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice.
569-4	**Comment:** *The Nicolet National Forest is supposed to be there for everyone to enjoy. The closing of these road will stop the aging folks and others who have health problems from accessing the deep woods where they have spent much of their past. To me this seems to be discriminating for these people.* **Response:** Thank you for your input; we encourage your continued use and enjoyment of the forest. Please see response to comment 260-1. We encourage you to participate in the submission of additional roads to be added to the annual MVUM update. The process is outlined on page 9 of the EA as well as Appendix B of the Decision Notice.
569-5	**Comment:** *Others of my family have visited the Eagle River office also regarding this problem. Chris has been very informative and helpful. I appreciate her time and effort. I was told sending thoughts and opinions to you may help our situation.* **Response:** Thank you for the positive feedback on our employees. We encourage you to stop by and provide input into this

	process at anytime. We look forward to working with the public. And again, this is an ongoing process with many more opportunities to provide input. The more specific you can be, the better we can serve your needs.
569-6	**Comment:** *Enclosed are maps that were given to me by your Eagle River office. We have highlighted the roads I am concerned about. The following road numbers are roads that we would like to see remained open if at all possible: Spec roads 2234, 2555, 2463 and 2165 (in their entirety); secondary roads (2 rut) 604376, 605358, 605353, 605350, 605342, 605348 and 605383. These roads if closed will greatly affect my capability of hunting and fishing throughout the remainder of my life in this area I love.* **Response:** Thank you for your road specific comments. All of the roads that you have listed are part of the Fishel project, which is a site specific project. The Roads Analysis for the Fishel project was completed in 2006. FR 2234, FR 2555, FR 2165, and FR 2463 were identified to remain open and available to public use, but the other roads that you have listed were all identified to be closed. Past decisions were not re-evaluated in this project.
569-7	**Comment:** *I have been told that this plan could be revisited annually and some changes made under certain circumstances - my question is why go the through the cost of reopening roads when it is not necessary to close them initially?* **Response:** Most of the roads not proposed for motorized designation are unauthorized roads, which are not part of the current road system. Unauthorized roads are those roads that the CNNF has not determined are necessary for the protection, administration, and utilization of the Forest. Therefore, the approach was to solicit roads from the public that were important to them and consider those roads for addition to our road system for public motorized use. This approach was one of many that we could have used.
569-8	**Comment:** *I don't understand the reasoning for this proposal as it has never been a problem in the 63 years our family has been in this part of the Nicolet. These roads have been there a very long time as you see. There are many, many more others who use these roads also.* **Response:** We appreciate your comment and encourage your continued enjoyment of the forest. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are making these changes..
569-9	**Comment:** V*icinity map attached to letter #569.* **Response:** Thank you for this map, it is helpful.
570-1	**Comment:** *We spend a great amount of time appreciating many miles of forest roads by taking car rides looking for wildlife, snowmobiling, and motorcycle riding. We take our children and their friends as well as out elderly parents who would be unable to walk in the forest. There has been 4 generations of our family doing this and we would be extremely disappointed if we lost this privilege.* **Response:** We appreciate your comment and encourage your continued enjoyment of the forest. Please see response to comments 181-3, 260-1. The decision only includes those roads that are under sole Forest Service jurisdiction. The designation

	of roads in the decision will initially include 2,363 miles of road available for public motorized vehicle use on the forest. The decision also designates 334 miles of trails to be available for public ATV use. There are approximately 4,500 miles of town, county and state roads also providing access to the National Forest for a total of approximately 6,800 miles of roads and trails available to public motorized use.
570-2	**Comment:** *I heard that the decision to eliminate motorized vehicles in the forest is to stop erosion. I do not understand this because we have witnessed no erosion in the many miles of forest we travel in. There are some sections where the large 4-wheel drive vehicles have created large ruts and some big hill areas that have erosion from heavy rains but I do not see how other motorized vehicles are to blame.* **Response:** Thank you for your input**.** Each road considered in our analysis was evaluated for resource risks, which were balance against public value. We have considered all environmental impacts in our decision. Please see the soils report in the EA for information concerning soil erosion.
570-3	**Comment:** *As a home owner in the national forest area, I am more concerned of the possibility of forest fires. If these forest roads are closed to motorized vehicles, the roads will become overgrown and firefighters will not be able to get into the forest. I would hate to see the Chequamegon-Nicolet Forest lost to fires just like California.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concern. The outcome of the Travel Management Rule is Our decision provides a designated network of roads and trails available for the general public's motorized use of motor vehicles. This network is only a portion of our entire transportation system. We will continue to use other roads for administrative access activities, such as timber harvesting, wildfire response, search and rescue, etc., is not dependent on public motorized access and is outside the scope of the analysis. Please note that we have determined that many of the unauthorized roads are not necessary for us to manage the national forest. Otherwise, we would have included them as part of our overall transportation system. Please be assured that the Forest Service and other emergency agencies We will continue to have the ability to access the Forest where needed to conduct forest management activities or emergency actions.
570-4	**Comment:** *I feel these forest plan changes are ridiculous. I always thought the forest was public and that all people should have the freedom to enjoy it. It is a source of recreation that I feel should not be eliminated. It is a source of great beauty and wonder for all of us. Please do not take that away from us.* **Response:** We understand that you do not want to lose any of the access you currently have. We will continue our process of evaluating every road on the Forest to determine what the long term transportation system will be. This process will take time. In the meantime, we encourage you to tell us if your access is affected. Not all roads that appear drivable will likely be available for public motorized use as it is important to balance access needs with resource protection where needed. Please note that there will be 6,800 miles of roads and trails accessing the Forest for your motorized use.
571-1	**Comment:** *Being a snowmobiler with a vacation home only 5 miles from the Chequamegon National Forest, I would like Alternative 1 when it comes to planning the policies for road usage in the national forest plan. Closing of roads would stop me*

	from using them to snowmobile, ATV, and hunt. **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Snowmobile use is outside the scope of TMR. Please see response to letter 181-3.
572-1	**Comment:** *Roads receive much use: Flynn Lake Rd (812), Big Brook Rd (380), Little Star Lake (293) fished often. We use Flynn Lake to canoe, dog train, bow and gun hunt. Bear baits number 30 plus on listed roads - baits that have been used for 20 plus years; family history. We enjoy getting back to both [unknown] at Little Star Lakes 801.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and informing us of areas where you enjoy the forest. FR 812, FR380, and 293 are all located within non-motorized areas. The 1986 Chequamegon NF plan made exceptions to keeping FR 380 and FR 812 open whereas the 2004 plan did not. Consideration for motorized access on any of the 3 roads is outside the scope of the project and cannot be considered for motorized access. FR 801 has been designated for hlv in the selected alternative, due to the close proximity to the non-motorized area boundary. Access to Lund Lake will be allowed.
572-2	**Comment:** *Many bear hunters not aware of this process.* **Response:** We agree wholeheartedly that public involvement is very important in the development of alternatives for proposed actions on forest lands. We held 15 open houses in 2007 to solicit public input on specific roads. Ten open houses were held in January and February 2007, five for the public and five for governmental entities. Five open houses were held in October 2007 to present our initial proposal to the public and to solicit additional comments. The Public Involvement section of the EA (page 5) also describes the process the Forest Service used to inform and involve the public for this project. In addition, we sent press releases to an extensive statewide media list that includes newspapers, television stations, and radio stations. We will continue to provide opportunities for the public to provide input to the map as it is updated each year. The more specific the feedback the better we can accommodate people's needs and interests. We encourage you to stay engaged.
572-3	**Comment:** *Need to remember - average age of these using the areas; locals; who help keep these roads open.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We welcome individuals of all ages to the Forest. We believe our decision provides ample access for everyone while minimizing the environmental impacts.
572-4	**Comment:** *Understand some of these roads were to be closed back in 2004, I'm new to the area, know they were never marked closed. If this was known, it would have been assessed then. Many people are upset - it is getting worse. Please do what you can to help keep these roads open.* **Response:** Thank you for your input. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are implementing this change and for a brief description of our decision. We encourage you continue to participate. Please let us know specifically which roads you use in the Forest and we will consider them in our next update to the motor vehicle use map.
573-2	**Comment:** *We live in Eagle River and spend a great deal of time in the Nicolet National Forest. It is always a special time when we get to take our children and grandchildren to appreciate the wilderness. With the proposed changes, our families will not be*

	able to carry on the tradition of hunting and fishing this area. **Response:** We encourage your continued use and enjoyment of the forest for your family. In our decision we added approximately 205 additional miles of roads to our travel system, which equates to a 49% reduction of the miles of roads under sole Forest Service jurisdiction. These roads are only part the total miles of roads accessing the Forest. The towns, counties, and the State have jurisdiction over approximately half of the roads accessing the Forest. The 49% of miles of sole Forest Service jurisdiction roads equates to 25% of total miles of roads on the Forest. There will be a total of approximately 6,800 miles of roads under all jurisdictions accessing the Forest. Most of the roads that will be unavailable for motorized use are unauthorized roads, which are not part of the current travel system. Many of these roads are only accessible by high clearance vehicles or not accessible at all. We encourage your participation in providing input to the MVUM as it is updated each year. The more specific the feedback, the better we can accommodate your needs and interests. Please see response to comment 181-3 for a description of why we are making these changes.
573-3	**Comment:** *As for wolf habitat and hunters, I have seen very few people hiking in all the years I have been in this area. I have never seen a wolf out there either.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and observations in the area. While one of the outcomes of this project would be a reduction in the number of miles of open roads within wolf pack territories, it is not one of the purposes of this project.
573-4	**Comment:** *Most of the roads in question are not maintained by the Forest Service. They are old logging roads and railroad grades that are being kept open by hunters that use them. We meet others from different parts of the state that also use these back roads.* **Response:** The roads that are being made unavailable to motorized use in this project are what we term unauthorized roads. We have not determined there is a need for these roads for the protection, administration or utilization of the Forest. It is not reasonable to put all of the unauthorized roads on the map for use without field data collection and validation. These are roads that are partially, if not totally, grown in with vegetation and where public vehicle access is already severely limited. The outcome of this project will be a motor vehicle use map that will be published in January 2009. This map will be updated annually and the public will have the opportunity to provide road specific comments. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice.
573-5	**Comment:** *The Eagle River Forest Service office has been great with information and maps of the area in question. Here are a list of the roads that concern us: Spec Roads 2234, 2555, 2165 and 2463; Secondary roads and grades 605376, 605358, 605353, 605350, 605342, 605348 and 605383. By closing these roads, it will defiantly affect hunting, fishing and enjoying the forest by many of us that are getting older and have physical problems preventing us from getting to areas that we love to hunt.* **Response:** Thank you for your road specific comment. All of the roads that you have listed are part of the Fishel project. The Roads Analysis for the Fishel project was completed in 2006. FR 2234, FR 2555, FR 2165, and FR 2463 were identified to remain open, but the other roads that you have listed were all identified to be closed. Decisions made under previous analysis

	were not re-evaluated.
573-6	**Comment:** *Map to accompany letter #573.* **Response:** Thank you for providing this helpful information.
574-1	**Comment:** *Closing 2,500 miles of roads in the Forest will have major negative impact on hunting, fishing and trapping in north central and northwestern Wisconsin. The US Forest Service's public input process to-date has been seriously flawed. Actual notice has not been provided to the great majority of sports groups in the state and to the tens, of thousands of sportsmen and women that use the forest. In addition public hearings were not held in central and southern Wisconsin where many of the forest users live. It was said best by Chequamegon Deputy Forest Supervisor Tony Erba in the July 17, 2008 Journal Sentinel article:" The sportsmen have not been fully engaging. I might be because they don't come into the forest until fall for hunting, and they live in some other part of the state." Because of this lack of adequate public input, the Wisconsin Wildlife Federation requests the US Forest Service to at least temporarily implement Alternative 1, the "No Action Alternative. Secondly, to get true public input into the impact of the proposed closure of the 2,500 miles of road, post each of the roads this fall hunting seasons with notices of the proposed road closures and information on how hunter, anglers, trapper and other recreational users can submit comments. That is the only way that the Forest Service will get the true opinions of the public about the closures.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Public involvement is very important to us with this project. It helps provide us valuable perspectives in how people use the national forest. Public involvement for the Travel Management Project began in Nov 2006 with the distribution of a brochure in areas where the public, including sportsmen, were likely to see them. The CNNF held 15 open houses in 2007 where public input on specific roads was solicited. Ten open houses were held in Jan/Feb 2007 five for the public and five for governmental entities. Five open houses were held in Oct 2007 to present our initial proposal to the public and to solicit additional comments. The Public Involvement section of the Decision Notice (pages 7-9) describes our process to inform and involve the public for this project. In addition, we sent press releases to an extensive statewide media list that includes newspapers, television stations, and radio stations. We will continually accept road suggestions from people who would like to see additional roads added to the MVUM. This will be a critical component on how we update the MVUM every year. Our first update is scheduled for March 2010.
574-2	**Comment:** *The closures as proposed will have major impact on the ability of sportsmen and women in this to hunt in the forest. This will likely result in significant increases in the deer population which in turn will have major impact on forest reproduction. In addition, there will be major economic losses to nearby communities as a result of the loss of hunting, fishing and trapping opportunities on the forest. Your final recreation report does not adequately address these major impacts. Please keep us fully informed of any further actions taken in regard to this matter.* **Response:** We recognize that some Deer Management Units on the CNNF are under population goals, some are at the desired goal, and others are above that goal. We also recognize that one of the tools for managing the deer populations in Wisconsin is through hunting. We acknowledge that deer do impact tree regeneration, crop damage, and have other effects on the natural

	community. The reduction in roads available for motorized use could increase the average distance that a hunter would have to walk in or haul bait or a deer stand. However, we are not aware of any definitive conclusion that this potential increase measurably affects a hunter's harvest success in determining the size of Wisconsin's deer population. We are also not aware of any conclusion that local economies would be adversely affected by our decision to designate roads and trails for public motor vehicle use. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
575-1	**Comment:** *I am against ATVs in the Forest as less than 5% of the pubic should not ruin the forest experience for the 95% of the public.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are implementing this change.
575-2	**Comment:** *Absolutely I will not allow you to send ATVs on 667. Cancel this road completely as my and Greg Motto's private properties are gated. Do not send ATVs into private property.* **Response:** We acknowledge that FR 667 becomes a private road once it leaves National Forest lands and has no jurisdiction or access rights on private property. FR 667 located on National Forest lands has been designated for hlv in the selected alternative. By designating the Forest Service portion of the road for motorized use, continued access by the private property owner will not require a permit.
575-3	**Comment:** *640 should be cars only - this road opens up ATVs to vas private lands adjacent to the north and to the east.* **Response:** FR 640 was reviewed and designated for hlv in the selected alternative. The level of motorized access was reduced based on public and Town of Spider Lake input.
575-4	**Comment:** *Map to accompany Letter #575.* **Response:** Thank you for this helpful information.
576-1	**Comment:** *The Town of Namekagon, at its meeting on August 12, made a motion seconded, and carried to request Road 332, off Forest Road 204, be left open to all motorized traffic. This road provides the only public access to Ghost Lake area and would keep the lake open to fishing and DNR lake management for fisheries. We further request that the Forest Service along with the town develop a parking area and boat access area at the same time.* **Response:** Thank you for your specific comment. FR322 is a gated closed road, so it is outside scope of the project. Current access routes being used are W223273 and W223275. These 2 roads have been added to the August 2008 analysis due to public comment that also concerns maintaining lake access. W223273 and W223275 are designate for atv and hlv in the selected alternative. These routes will provide motorized access to Ghost Lake.

577-1	**Comment:** *There is a road on the eastern edge of our township named Partridge Trail Road that has been a legal town road for many years from Diamond Roof Road all the way to Forest Hill Road. Attached is a copy of the current Oconto County Plat Book page 64 that shows this road clearly marked. In your travel plan proposal you break this road into several parts including: On the north end it is referred to as Forest Road 2027 In the middle area it is referred to as Forest Road 93715 The portion of the road that goes through private property is not delineated at all The southern portion of this road is listed as Forest Road 2027B Due to budget constraints we have not focused on this road recently. However, we must object in the strongest possible terms to your plan to close off the portion called 93715 to all public motor vehicle access. This simply is not acceptable for several reasons including public access in this area of the township, fire control or emergency vehicle access. We ask that you change your designation to legal Highway vehicle access from Diamond Roof Road to Forest Hill Road. We also ask that you agree that this road is an ATV legal road in the Forest Section. Our township has already designated this entire road as ATV legal.* **Response:** This road was visited in the fall of 2007 by our transportation planner. At that time it was difficult to drive from Diamond Roof road to Forest Hill road. There were several trees across the road and it could only be driven with a 4 wheel drive vehicle. We also reviewed the current town road maps and this road does not appear on it. It does appear on the plat book as you have said. At this time it is not clear to the Travel Management team whether this is indeed a town road. We feel we can't display a road that crosses private land unless we have some type of indication that it is indeed an open public road. Please also note that administrative access for fire suppression is not affected by this project. There is a system of roads already in place for this purpose.
577-2	**Comment:** *A member of the town board has reviewed with your staff at the combination of roads listed as 2922B and 938432 just east of Hwy 32. We are asking that this section of former town road be reopened to all vehicle traffic including ATVs. There is significant development on the northeast corner of our township. Currently the citizens living there have only one way out of the area via Spring Lake Rd to Pickerel Lake Road. We believe that having an alternate route "out of the woods" to Hwy 32 is prudent. It is also important to have an alternative for fire and emergency vehicle to reach this area. We understand that Red Arrow Snowmobile ATV Club is also interested in this pair of roads. We support their efforts to develop a riding loop utilizing these roads and Forest Road 2922A (Wildwood Trail). This loop would connect on both ends with the newly developed ATV route on Forest Service land at the county line.* **Response:** FR 2922B and 938432 were reviewed and designated for hlv in the selected alternative. FR 2922A was reviewed and designated for atv only in the selected alternative for the portion running east to west. FR 2922B and 938432 were not designated for ATV use, at this time, since the district would like to take a more comprehensive look at the entire future ATV system. Please contact the District so we can work together to develop expanded ATV access. Please also note that administrative access for fire suppression is not affected by this project. There is a system of roads already in place for this purpose.
577-3	**Comment:** *Map to accompany letter #577.* **Response:** Thank you for this helpful information.

578-1	**Comment:** *Trail 51425 is a spur that terminates just short of Pine Rock Rd and the corner of our property. If motorized travel is authorized on 51425 we will be dealing with trespassers on a regular basis, which I would like to avoid. Therefore, please close 51425 to motorized travel.* **Response:** Road 51425 has been designated for hlv in the selected alternative. This is part of a cluster of roads that the district has had many discussions on and have field verified. The majority of these roads were built as temporary logging roads. This entire area is one of the wetter locations the district has on the ground so the roads selected to be open were done according to their landscape condition (high ground) and current condition. The district left roads open to provide a through road to provide a loop for a motorized hunting/recreational opportunity. I recommend that this area not be designated as ATV for several reasons: 1) there are no town roads that it links to to provide an ATV connector or loop. 2) The general nature of the landscape is on a wetter gradient. 3) There are several private land withholding in this area that have expressed concerns regarding ATV travel.
579-1	**Comment:** *[Bayfield County Snowmobile Alliance] works in close coordination with the ATV clubs and the Forest Service in Bayfield County, and want to share trails where the trail is environmentally suitable for ATVs; where state ATV funding is available and adequately used to maintain shared trails and grade them prior to winter use. We also require that winter ATV snow grooming funding be provided. We do have problems with adequate grading, by the Forest Service; in the Washburn District of the forest and hope their gradual improvement will become adequate.* **Response:** The Forest encourages partnerships to ensure recreational needs for the forest are addressed. We look forward to working with your group and encourage you to contact the local Washburn District office for issues related to road maintenance in the area.
579-2	**Comment:** *The Alliance supports the addition of ATV use to Trail 63 from Drummond northeast to the Forest boundary to connect with ATV trails near Grand View. This has been discussed with Forest personnel for several years and had expected it to be included in this plan. Please give it further consideration as a northern connect out of Drummond is very desirable.* **Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. Trail 63 is a county trail system designation and runs on an abandoned railroad grade which is in fact Forest Trail (FT) 501. The trail has been evaluated and designated for atv in the selected alternative. Use by snowmobiles will continue.
579-3	**Comment:** *The ATV connection west of Drummond, from the Bearpaw Trail (Trail 7) to the Horsepasture Grade Road (Trail 6) appears to be included in this project and is strongly supported by the Alliance.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
580-1	**Comment:** *We are objecting to trails that are short, dead end at town roads, and those that are accessed by non-motorized traffic. These trails are: 654, 655, 657, 638, 622E, 206A, 709, 675, and 687.* **Response:** Thank you for your site specific comment. With the exception of FR 206A and FR 709, all roads identified by the commenter have been reviewed and identified for hlv in the selected alternative based on Town of Spider Lake input. FR 206A

	and FR 709 were reviewed and designated for hlv and atv in the selected alternative due to high associated values and low risks to resources associated with the roads.
580-2	**Comment:** *We suggest you try to connect 637 to 497, 1727 to 636, and 650 or 650A to 1685.* **Response:** In order to provide a connection between roads submitted by the commenter, designated snowmobile trails would have to be added to the system as roads or have trail segments designated for mixed use. We did not consider the use or conversion of the identified snowmobile trails as connectors for other motorized use. As a result the Forest will analyze and evaluate these trails for possible mixed use in the first annual update.
580-3	**Comment:** *Parking facilities need to be installed since parking is not allowed on town roads.* **Response:** Parking and other facility construction is outside the scope of analysis.
580-4	**Comment:** *The purpose of the ATV trail system is to travel from the northwestern part of the state to the southern part of the state. This is not being accomplished with the proposed trail system.* **Response:** Federal designation of routes and trails is limited to the areas within our jurisdiction, namely the Chequamegon-Nicolet NF. As a Forest we have tried to provide connector trails to various communities near our landbases that will provide supplies for ATV users and often times a boost to the area economy. We will continue to do this as TMR implementation continues. Since there are no federal lands that can connect the southern portion of Wisconsin to the northwestern portion, it would be up to the adjoining counties and the state to develop trails that would tie into our existing and proposed trails. In some cases this has occurred. Examples of this can be seen in the Tuscobia and the Flambeau ATV trails connected through the city of Park Falls to provide over a hundred miles of trail riding while opening up areas to a possible tourism driven economy.
581-1	**Comment:** *Although the roads 380, 812, 293, and 801 should be left open for people to use for hunting, berry picking, and fishing closing these roads will be a waste of our natural resources because the lakes would rarely be fished because the majority of the people that fish them are older people and will not be able to walk in to fish them. As far as I am concerned you are discriminating against the senior people.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; we encourage you to continue to use the forest for your enjoyment. FR 812, FR380, and 293 are all located within non-motorized areas. The 1986 Chequamegon NF plan made exceptions to keeping FR 380 and FR 812 open whereas the 2004 plan did not. Consideration for motorized access on any of the 3 roads is outside the scope of the project and cannot be considered for motorized access. FR 801 has been designated for hlv in the selected alternative, due to the close proximity to the non-motorized area boundary. Access to Lund Lake will be allowed.
582-1	**Comment:** *Our club has been working with several other clubs to facilitate ATV trail development on the Nicolet side of the Forest. For the last year we have been meeting quarterly with Darrell Richards, Larry Sandoval and now Jeff Seefeldt to increase riding opportunities. Personally, I have been at all of the scheduled meetings in the TMR process. There are several items we*

	will list to give input on for your final decision. **Response:** We appreciate your attendance at these meetings and look forward to your comments.
582-2	**Comment:** *Our club supports the third alternative for road 2922A known locally as Wildwood Trail. This former town road intersects with the new Nicolet Trail and ends at Spring Lake Road that is a legal ATV route. Currently there is a huge mudhole on this road that makes it impassible for anything but the largest mudder trucks. Our club has applied for a grant to the DNR to upgrade this road for ATV use and filling the mudhole. The DNR will fund this segment only if it is gated and made available for ATV/Snowmobile use only. It also has an impact on our next request. The likelihood of DNR funding will be increased if this segment is looped with the following. We have talked on several occasions with Forest Service staff about road segments 2922B and 938432. These segments were former town roads that were not maintained in the recent past. The Town of Townsend is requesting that these roads be maintained in some manner for safety reasons due to development in that part of the town. We support their request as long as ATV use is allowed. Our conversations with your staff member Darrell Richards involved making an ATV loop from the Nicolet Trail utilizing Wildwood Trail, a short segment of Spring Lake Road and the above roads back to the main trail. The DNR has stated that they prefer to fund "riding loops" as opposed to dead end trails. Working together we can make a very desirable ATV opportunity while increasing emergency access for town residents.* **Response:** Thank you for this suggestion. FR 2922B and 938432 were reviewed and designated for hlv in the selected alternative. FR 2922A was reviewed and designated for atv only in the selected alternative for the portion running east to west. FR 2922B and 938432 were not designated for ATV use, at this time, since the district would like to take a more comprehensive look at the entire future ATV system. We encourage you to continue working with the District for expanding ATV access.
582-3	**Comment:** *In our initial comments dated October 23, 2007, we discussed Partridge Trail Rd. You have it listed as roads 2027, 93715, and 2027B. Despite the fact that Partridge Trail is a legal township road and listed on the Oconto County Plat book records (copy attached) from Diamond Roof Rd. all the way to Forest Hill Rd. you have listed portion 93715 as closed to all motor vehicle traffic. Our club is strongly opposed to this designation. We support the Town of Townsend's position that this is a Town of Townsend legal road all the way and therefore open to ATV travel as a town route. As the town will pint out this route has not been maintained to gas tax road standards in the recent past due to budget issues. However, our club and the township agree that it is a town road and therefore under township control.* **Response:** This road was visited in the fall of 2007 by our transportation planner. At that time it was difficult to drive from Diamond Roof road to Forest Hill road. There were several trees across the road and it could only be driven with a 4 wheel drive vehicle. We also reviewed the current gas tax maps and this road does not appear on it. It does appear on the plat book as you have said. At this time it is not clear to the Travel Management team whether this is indeed a town road. We feel we can't display a road that crosses private land unless we have some type of indication that it is indeed an open public road.
582-4	**Comment:** *Previously we had asked that the existing snowmobile trail thru the Jones Spring area be opened to ATV use. We are looking to provide an ATV route north from Hwy 64 and T to the Townsend area. To keep away from the Jones Spring non-*

	motorized area we are asking that roads 937367 and 944128 be made legal for ATV use. We would then be able to connect with Sawyer Lake Road (Gas tax road 2122) and gas tax roads 2283 and 2118 to complete a route south. **Response:** Thank you for this suggestion. 937367 and 944428 were reviewed and designated for hlv in the selected alternative. 937367 was shown to be of high value and low risk while 94428 was shown to have low value and low risk. These roads were not designated for ATV use, at this time. The district would like to take a more comprehensive look at the future ATV system.
582-5	**Comment:** *We support alternative 3 regarding Forest Road 94326 that connects Bonita Grade to points west. There is some concern about the value of a short ATV season because of the closure until August 1st. We would prefer that this route be open during the entire ATV season.* **Response:** Thank you for this suggestion also. 94326 was reviewed and designated for Seasonal-hlv, atv in the selected alternative. This road was shown to have low value and high risk. This road may have been rated as low value but it does get a lot of hunter use and other fall uses. This road was given the seasonal designation to mitigate the potential disturbance risk along this road.
582-6	**Comment:** *We support the alternative 3 designations for roads 3163, 2314, and 2316 in the Hwy 64 area. We also support the designation of 2291, 943414 and 943416 to provide ATV access to the Hwy 64 and T intersection. This would provide a complete ATV loop from the Nicolet Trail.* **Response:** Thank you for your road specific comment. FR 3163, and FR 2291 were reviewed and designated for hlv; atv in the selected alternative. Portions of 943414 and 943416 were reviewed and designated for atv in the selected alternative. FR 2314 is a town road and would have to be designated by the town too.
582-7	**Comment:** *With the opening of the Nicolet State Trail thru the Townsend area there will be significantly more ATVs attracted to our area. We believe that our working together with other clubs and the Forest Service to provide more riding opportunities is a must. Many hours have been spent trying to find routes and trails that make this possible while being environmentally sensitive. We look forward to continued cooperation with the Forest Service to make this happen.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments and suggestions. We also look forward to working with you to identify the appropriate routes and loops for atv access.
583-1	**Comment:** *Randy urges the forest to keep roads open. Wisconsin families need this recreation.* **Response:** Thanks for your review of the project, please see response to comment 181-3.
584-1	**Comment:** *I recommend that you take Alternative 1 to the Eagle River-Florence Ranger District.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. Maintaining such a large and dispersed network of roads and trails (as described in Alternative 1) would likely lead to unintended consequences. The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along

	with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We believe this still avoids forcing people into the same area. Please see response to comment 181-3 for further explanation on why Alternative 1 was not chosen.
584-2	**Comment:** *My concern is with the road 3861 that leads back to Bailey's Lake in the Nicolet National Forest. This road provides me and my family access back to this lake to enjoy the natural beauty and the wildlife in this area. This road is listed as one of the roads that would be considered for closure if alternatives 2 and 3 were chosen. Without this road I am not sure we would ever get the opportunity to visit this area again as my oldest child has severe asthma and my father is not able to walk long distances. My father has been visiting this lake for many years and hopes to be able to continue to visit and hunt in this area even when he is unable to physically walk to it by the use of this road.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your experiences on the Forest. Your continued access is important. FR 3861A, 616466, and 6161116 provide access to the west side of Bailey Lake. These roads have been reviewed and designated for hlv in the selected alternative.
585-1	**Comment:** *Please accept the attached resolution as comments submitted by the Vilas County Board of Supervisors on the travel management rule (resolution same as comment 504-3–10).* **Response:** Thank you for submitting this resolution. Other counties submitted the same resolution. Please see our response to the resolution in comments 504-3 through 504-10.
586-1	**Comment:** *WHEREAS, one of the main sources of economic activity in the town of Drummond is tourism. The forest visitors are not only out of state persons, but in state residents, both seasonal and full time. This tourism relies heavily on fishing and hunting deer, bear, grouse, turkey as well as berry picking and hiking. Many of these pursuits need vehicular access to get to sites.* **Response:** The economic impacts of motorized use in Wisconsin are controversial (see Recreation report). We understand your concern. Unfortunately, we did not find any definitive conclusion that supports that our decision will result in an adverse economic effect to local economies. We found in our research that motor vehicle use can benefit both tourism and related dollars to local communities. However, we also found countering costs due to increased law enforcement needs and environmental damage. Finally, we found no evidence in our research that concentrating motorized use on fewer roads will reduce recreation overall. Please see Appendix A to this document for a more detailed response to the economic concern you address. Please also note that we will continually accept specific comments for inclusion in the next update to the motor vehicle use map. If there are specific roads that would beneficial to your area, let us know. The more specific you can be, the better we can address your needs. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
586-2	**Comment:** *WHEREAS, the more roads that are closed, the more heavily visited will be the lakes and hunting areas, which abut main roads. This could crate safety issues due to concentrations of hunters in the same places. Parking along roadways is also a safety issue due to visitor's highway legal vehicles not being able to get into the woods from main roads.*

	Response: Thank you for your comment and we understand your concern that many hunters could be using the same areas due to the motorized access available to them. We have found no evidence that hunters will only hunt where motorized access is allowed. We have heard from many other hunters who prefer a non-motorized experience and support our proposals. We believe our decision provides a balance between motorized and non-motorized experiences and believe there will be adequate access for everyone. We encourage you stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process. Regarding your parking issue: parking along road right of ways, while legal, should be done so as to not cause a safety issue. We recommend the user park off of the road with enough distance so that it does not impede other driver's line of sight. .
586-3	**Comment:** *WHEREAS, the population of the town of Drummond, according to statistics from the 2000 census and the town's comprehensive plan, has 49% of its residents 50 years of age or older. Closing the majority of roads limits accessibility to the forest to the old, infirm, and those with disabilities.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and concern. The Forest Service welcomes all people, including individuals who have disabilities, to the National Forests and Grasslands. Outdoor recreation is about individual choice, including the type of recreation opportunity and the type of access. We can help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We also can direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences: easy access and the sense of remoteness. We are committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking. In this project, the Travel Management Project, we are designating National Forest System roads and trails for motor vehicle use as directed by the National Travel Management Rule. The motor vehicle use designation decisions are made through a planning process with public participation that evaluates current and potential impacts due to the operation of specific vehicle types on natural and cultural resources, public safety, recreation opportunities, conflict among uses and access needs. Individuals who use a wheelchair to aid in mobility are permitted to take that device anywhere foot traffic is allowed, including in designated wilderness. A wheelchair is defined according to 36 CFR 212.2, Forest Service Manual 2350.5 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Title V, Section 507(c) as any device, including one that is battery-powered, that is designed solely for use by a mobility-impaired person for locomotion, and that is suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area. We encourage anyone with disabilities or restricted ability to contact us to discuss the type of experience they are seeking (such as fishing and dispersed camping) and their means of access and we will help them locate an area that best suits their recreational needs. Your ability to use the Forest is important to us. We encourage you stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). The more specific you can be the better we can address your needs. Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
586-4	**Comment:** *WHEREAS, the town board of Drummond has had public meetings at which numerous citizen members have made comments on the proposed closings. WHEREAS, the town board wishes to provide useful and necessary comment which will*

	affect which roads will remain open. NOW THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED that the town board of the town of Drummond supports the proposal which leaves the number of roads open to highway legal vehicles as it presently is (Alternative 1), with the following priorities of essential roads to be designated as open: 380 - access to Big Brook Lake for fishing and wildlife viewing for all segments of the population, 812 - access to Flynn Lake for fishing and wildlife viewing for all segments of the population, 293 - Access to Little Star Lake for fishing and wildlife viewing for all segments of the population, 801 - Access to Lund Lake for fishing and wildlife viewing for all segments of the population. W514125 designation should be changed to ATV and snowmobile only since travel on it is an essential connector between Horse Pasture Grade and the trail into Drummond. **Response:** We believe that a designated route system is appropriate for public motorized use and can be very effective in providing adequate access while ensuring we are able to sustain the resources on the National Forest. This decision is tailored to the needs of citizens who utilize this forest. It will continue to be developed in collaboration with people who use this Forest. Regarding your suggestions for lake access: FR 812, FR380, and 293 are all located within non-motorized areas. The 1986 Chequamegon NF plan made exceptions to keeping FR 380 and FR 812 open whereas the 2004 plan did not. Consideration for motorized access on any of the 3 roads is outside the scope of the project and cannot be considered for motorized access. FR 801 has been designated for hlv in the selected alternative, due to the close proximity to the non-motorized area boundary. Access to Lund Lake will be allowed. Additionally, W514125 is designate for atv only in the selected alternative.
588-1	**Comment:** *The travel management project being proposed in the Chequamegon-Nicolet is another nail in the coffin for the state of Wisconsin. Its residents, tourism, and fire protection Our older residents, the handicapped and others who enjoy the forest will be stopped or severely curtailed in their ability to travel to favorite hunting and fishing spots. Game management will be more difficult. This is also another step, a large one at that to stop logging all together. The USFS is no longer an asset to this great nation and a huge liability to proper land and game management. I am opposed to any further reduction in road use. No more closures.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concerns with us. Others shared similar concerns; please see responses to comments 332-3 regarding tourism, 180-1 regarding individuals with disabilities, and comment 340-3 regarding administrative access for timber harvesting and fire suppression.
589-1	**Comment:** *The road closure being proposed for the Nicolet and Chequamegon National Forest is of great concern. The town of Phelps sits in the heart of the Nicolet. We do not need or want any more road closures in the Town of Phelps.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concern. We believe our decision provides for a sustainable and accessible network of roads and trails for motorized use. We encourage you to stay engaged with our process. Our decision provides for an adaptive management process which allows for public suggestions to be submitted continually to either add or remove specific roads or trails to the designated network. The process of submission of roads for future use is outlined on page 9 of the EA and in Appendix B of the Decision Notice. It is important to us that you be able to continue to use the Forest.
589-2	**Comment:** *The Forest Service needs to increase its current levels of harvesting timber. More road closures will not allow this to*

	happen. We rely on tourism for a lot of our economy. Restricting the use of our National Forest will not help the northern economy, and our senior citizens and all families that enjoy the outdoors. **Response:** Thank you for your concerns. This project is focused on public motorized access. The amount and general location of timber harvesting on the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest is addressed in the current Forest Plan. It is not part of the Travel Management Rule decision. The system of roads, as well as roads available for administrative use, that will remain under the Travel Management Rule decision and future revisions will allow for any timber harvesting implemented under Forest Plan direction. Scientific evidence does not show that reducing the overall miles of road available will reduce tourism or have a negative effect on the economy. Please see Appendix A for additional information related to economic concerns.
590-1	**Comment:** *I would like to see alternative 2 adopted by the Forest Service for access to the Forest. I see a lot of misuse and damage to secondary roads, leading to rutting, habitat destruction, sedimentation of small creeks, and disturbance of wildlife. Using the forest as I do, noise by vehicles is also increasing and therefore disturbing.* **Response:** We appreciated your comments. Others sent in similar comments; please see response to comment 185-1.
591-1	**Comment:** *First of all we strongly support Mr. Tom Tiffany and his editorial comments in the Vilas County News Review Vol. 123, No. 21 (08/13/2008). We do however have a question for you: what is the upside for the residents of Northern Wisconsin in the proposed closing of the roads/lands of the CNNF? Please send your answer to XXXXX.* **Response:** Thank you for your question. The “upside” to our decision depends on which perspective you have. From a motor vehicle user’s perspective, the MVUM provides clear guidance on where a motor vehicle can be legally operated. The roads and trails displayed on the map assure the forest user that they can operate a motor vehicle with little to no environmental damage. Our decision and evaluation process has accounted for the resource risks for a particular road. Plus, our decision still provides over 6,800 miles of road in the national forest to travel with wheeled motor vehicles when you account for all jurisdictions (township, county, State, and federal). We believe this amount of road miles provides ample access for people while also minimizing the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. For a person who chooses to use the national forest without a motor vehicle, they can be assured that they can use certain areas of the forest with no motor vehicles present. This experience is what these forest users are seeking. Many people shared with us that they seek quiet and solitude, listening only to the sounds of the woods, whether it be for hiking, berry picking, or hunting. Finally, we will continually listen to people and accept specific information they have for roads and trails as we update the MVUM. We strive to provide the access and experience (both motorized and non-motorized) that people desire so they can enjoy the national forest.
592-1	**Comment:** *My wife and I are both in our late 60's and have been enjoying the Nicolet National Forest since the early 1950's. We enjoy walking with our dogs on the many trails; however some of the areas special to us are too far to walk round trip. We have been visiting Bailey Lake (former Round Lake in the Thunder Lake Logging era) since the 1970's. We like to have our morning*

	coffee by the lake and have seen otter, loon, ducks, geese, beaver, fisher, deer and fox on our many visits. If this road (on Map 6161- Road 3861A that goes to 116 and 117) were closed as planned, we would have about a 4 mile round trip walk. This would make it nearly impossible for us to visit the lake and share its many natural gifts with our grandchildren. **Response:** Thank you for sharing your experiences at your special place in the Forest. FR 3861A, 616466, and 6161116 provide access to the west side of Bailey Lake. These roads have been reviewed and designated for hlv in the selected alternative.
592-2	**Comment:** *More open roads mean a better and wider distribution of hunters allowing for a much safer season.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and we understand your concern that many hunters could be using the same areas due to the motorized access available to them. We have found no evidence that hunters will only hunt where motorized access is allowed. We have heard from many other hunters who prefer a non-motorized experience and support our proposals. We believe our decision provides a balance between motorized and non-motorized experiences and believe there will be adequate access for everyone. We encourage you stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
592-3	**Comment:** *More open roads give better access to fighting forest fires that can lead to massive devastation.* **Response:** Thank you for your concern regarding fire suppression. The outcome of the Travel Management Rule is a designated network of roads and trails for public motorized use. This network is only a portion of our entire transportation system. Administrative access, such as timber harvesting, fire response, etc., is not dependent on public motorized access and is outside the scope of the analysis. Please be assured that the Forest Service and other emergency agencies will have the ability to access the Forest where needed to conduct forest management activities or emergency actions.
593-1	**Comment:** *Connecting roads listed are important to keep open. They complete loops for hunting. Roads: 50234- runs from 439 south to 446; N505110- runs from 697 NW to 694; 50947- runs from 431 SE to 245.* **Response:** Thank you for your road specific comments. Road 50324 was evaluated and designated for hlv and atv in the selected alternative. This road is off of North Boundary Road. It is currently used as HLV and ATV. This route provides access to other ATV routes such as 446, 816A and ATV trail. Road W505110 was closed under a previous decision; as a result, consideration for motorized use is outside the scope of the project. Field review by District personnel determined this road is bermed at both ends, although there is some evidence berms are being driven around. It was determined that road 50947 is a closed road. As a result consideration for motorized use is outside the scope of the project.
593-2	**Comment:** *Supportive of closing the dead end roads that don't lead anywhere. Supportive of concentrated traffic, thinks it is great and better for hunting.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your thoughts on dead end roads. To some Forest users, dead end roads provide valuable

	access for hunting, dispersed camping, firewood gathering and bough gathering. As land managers we need to balance the needs of all people and their desired use of the Forest.
594-1	**Comment:** *The closure of various roads will decrease opportunity and access to areas in the Chequamegon-Nicolet Forests. This will limit or completely access to some areas for handicap, elderly and physically challenged individuals in regards to berry picking, hunting, fishing, photography, wildlife and natural area viewing.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your concerns. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are making these changes. Please also see response to comment 180-1 for a discussion on access for disabled individuals.
594-2	**Comment:** *Roads that I wish/want to remain open that are targeted in Alternatives 2 and 3, Not just seasonal: 449, 241B, 420=+ATV, 420A + ATV, 419A to 420, 418 and 418A, 393 and 393A, 400A, 505411 to 443, W508426-Retain, W508437= Hunting, 418=Retain, 241A=Retain, Decommission 426 as shown in the Fishbone project.* **Response:** Thank you for your road specific comments. The following road designations were reviewed based on the Travel Management EA and public comments. Each road is listed with the designation for the selected alternative: 449 - hlv and atv (excludes portion of 449 south of FR 241); 241B – none; 420 - hlv and atv from south termini north to intersection with road 50842 (also see response to comment letter 424-1); 420A - hlv (see response to comment letter 424-1); 419A - hlv and atv; 418 - hlv and atv; 393 - hlv; 400A - Fall access, hlv and atv; W508437 - hlv. FR 241A was analyzed as a result of public comment and designation is no motorized access in the selected alternative. Road 505411 is a town road and outside the scope of the project. FR418A does not exist in the Forest road inventory; therefore no determination could be made. Comment on FR 426 noted.
595-1	**Comment:** *Our family has owned property on Partridge Trail in the Town of Townsend for many years. We understand that you have intentions of closing the center segment of this road that you list as Forest Road 93715. Partridge Trail has always been considered a town road and we have used entire road over the years. Our family strongly opposes your position on closing this road. Please consider this letter our support of the Town of Townsend's position that this is a town road and that vehicle access should be maintained all the way from Diamond Roof Road to Forest Hill road.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. This road was visited in the fall of 2007 by our transportation planner. At that time it was difficult to drive from Diamond Roof road to Forest Hill road. There were several trees across the road and it could only be driven with a 4 wheel drive vehicle. We also reviewed the current gas tax maps and this road does not appear on it. It does appear on the plat book. At this time it is not clear to the Travel Management team whether this is indeed a town road. We feel we can't display a road that crosses private land unless we have some type of indication that it is indeed an open public road.
603-1	**Comment:** *We agree with the proposed action. Rd. 393 that is closed is a good hunting walking road. Ray owns a private 80 north of Pigeon Lake and took some time to look over the proposal and wanted to let us know he agrees and thinks we are good.* **Response:** Thank you for your review of specific roads related to this project.

604-1	**Comment:** *Feels the closures will impact all hunting in the state of Wisconsin, which will impact the local businesses. Has not seen maps of EA, but wants to make sure roads in barrens are open t hunt and pick blueberries.* **Response:** Please see response to comment 217-1 for issues related to hunting; also see response to comments 181-3 for an explanation of why we are implementing this project and 332-3 regarding economic issues.
604-2	**Comment:** *FR 690 is a dumping ground. Tom has picked up the garbage twice last year. How will FS catch those using roads for dumping?* **Response:** Thank you for alerting us to this issue. Dumping cases are hard to catch as you well know. When people like yourself report these type of infractions, areas like FR 690 can be patrolled more often.
605-1	**Comment:** *Good approach with trying to balance resources and habitat with access. Like that it keeps habitat intact for various species. Allows for a more positive experience for hikers because it reduces impact of ATV noise on the ecosystem and hiker experience. Is very supportive of reducing number of roads open to public. Feels like "having 35% of the roads open is plenty!"* **Response**: Thank you for your review of our project and taking the time to comment.
606-1	**Comment:** *My first choice would be alternative #1 for the short term. I have witnessed first hand the increased number of roads carved into the National Forest in my area and appreciate the desire/need to discontinue the depletion of the forest. To that end, I would suggest that in future logging contracts, that a provision be inserted that would require loggers to make inaccessible any new logging roads crated by their logging efforts upon completion of their cutting. All managers should make this a practice even though it is optional. This would stop future depletion of the national forest while providing for necessary logging recognized by sound forestry management practice. If this were done immediately, alternative map #1 would be feasible. I say this because in my years of traveling the national forest, many of the logging roads have, in fact, grown over and are no longer accessible today. So some reclamation is currently happening now. Road #942180 is an example. This "road" is now a walking trail at best. Evergreens have grown over the path and trees have fallen. Even motor cycles cannot utilize this route today. Road 2324A also is currently impassable. My second choice would be alternative map #3. The main reason is that due to the anticipated shock to many outdoorsman when they discover their favorite road(s) have been closed, the expansion could remain manageable from your end as new considerations are made in future years. With the above logging provision all new roads would be halted while less necessary roads could be closed with the littlest amount of turmoil. Although the map may eventually look more like alternative #2 some day, a smoother transition would result while accomplishing to ultimate goal.* **Response:** Thank you for your thoughtful review of our alternatives**.** The decision as to whether a road is left open, closed, or decommissioned, after a timber sale is completed, is determined based on future access needs to the area. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why choosing alternative 1 would not be a responsible choice.
606-2	**Comment:** *Specifically: My travels through the national forest suggest the following changes to Alternative map 3#. Consideration #1: Please consider keeping the following roads open to allow continuing access to the national forest from the*

	Crooked Lake, Grindle Lake and Sunrise Lake areas. On the map, 6 miles east of Mountain on "W" to Neligan Lake and directly east of the lake: 941420, 941425, 941423 & (2309E remains open). Consideration #2: Please consider keeping open the following roads: this allows for access south of private property on Tar Dam Road while keeping a large expanse of untouched forest to the south of Tar Dam Road and west of the Waupee Flowage. 939259 and 2606. **Response:** Thank you for your road specific suggestions. 941420, 941425, 941423, and 939259 were reviewed and designated for hlv in the selected alternative. FR 2309E and 2606 are currently open system roads and will remain open to hlv.
607-1	**Comment:** *Opposed to closing any roads.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your opinion. Others expressed a similar opinion. Please see response to letter 181-3.
608-1	**Comment:** *Not in favor at all - does not think we should be closing access to FS land.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 181-3
609-1	**Comment:** *Supports Alt. 3 - likes to have more options.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; the decision chose Alternative 3 as modified. Please see the Decision Notice for slight modifications to this alternative.
610-1	**Comment:** *Against closing roads.* **Response:** Thank you for this comment. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are implementing this project.
611-1	**Comment:** *I am a northwoods property owner, and my best friend owns a hunting camp in Forest County. We have done all of our hunting and fishing in Forest and Vilas counties over the past 40 years, and vehicle access to the many forest roads has been an extremely important part of successful, quality outings. The closing of a large percentage of those roads would severely limit the ability to access some of the territory we have traditionally hunted and fished. In addition, I fail to see the purpose for the closure of the proposed roads. I can't imagine that doing so would make such a profound difference in forest or land quality. It will, however, have an immediate impact on many people who use the areas in question for recreation as well as the businesses in the region that are supported, to a large extent, by those very same folks. I strongly urge the powers that be to reconsider their position on this matter. I know I speak for my entire deer hunting crew (10 members) when I ask that this legislation not be passed.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and sharing how you use the Forest. We encourage your continued enjoyment of our forest. Please see response to comment 181-3 for a discussion of why we are implanting these changes. Please see response to comment 332-3 for a discussion on the economic issue. Please also note that this is an ongoing project. The motor vehicle use map will be updated annually. We have put in place a process whereby we will continually accept suggestions for roads to

	be added or deleted from the map. The more specific you can be, the better we can serve your needs. We look forward to working with you and others in your crew if you have specific roads you want to be considered in the annual map updates. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice.
612-1	**Comment:** *Keep all of our forest roads open. Alternative 1.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; also see response to comment 181-3.
613-1	**Comment:** *Keep the roads open. ALTERNATIVE 1. Americans are getting older. We need access to OUR PUBLIC LANDS BOUGHT WITH TAXPER MONEY. Choose ALTERNATIVE 1* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and suggestions. Others expressed similar comments, please see responses to comments 181-3 and 241-1.
614-1	**Comment:** *Easy access to public lands is important to all who wish to enjoy them, including many who would be adversely affected and denied access without motorized transportation. The vast majority of people cannot afford to own and maintain large tracts of recreational land. Many outdoorsmen (and women) of all ages, due to physical limitations, would be unable to access these remote areas for sporting, leisure and recreational purposes without vehicular transport. For some, the beautiful drive itself into these forested wilderness areas is the very reason for their use. Closure of existing roads means effectively denying access to many of the taxpayer citizens who own them. For these reasons, I strongly favor Alternative 1 and keeping the forest roads open.* **Response:** Thank you for your taking the time to express your concerns. We welcome visitors of all ages and abilities. The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with wheeled motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We believe this amount of road miles provides ample access for people while also minimizing the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. We will continually accept specific suggestions for additional road and trails as we update the MVUM. We strive to provide the access people need so they enjoy the outdoors on the national forest.
615-1	**Comment:** *Access to the forest is very important for me. I access the forest in all seasons and do not support the closing of any roads or routes in any season. If environmental issues are found, a re-route should be established. - Additional routes should be add.* **Response:** Your access is important to us as well. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are making these changes and for additional information as to the decision.
615-2	**Comment:** *I am disappointed in the configurations of the other alternatives. They seem to offer a carrot in return for agreeing with reductions in access. The National Forests are for all users, not just young wilderness loving backpackers.* **Response:** We agree, and welcome all visitors to the Forest. We believe our decision provides a balance of access for

	everyone. It also provides ample access with approximately 6800 miles of roads and trails accessing the Forest. Please see response to comment 181-3 for additional information regarding this project.
615-3	**Comment:** *If the National Forests continue to restrict access to citizens that need the assistance of ORV or other forms of transportation, the burden to serve these folks will be directed to the State, County and local landowners.* **Response:** Thank you for your concern. We are more than happy to help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We can also direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences, easy access and the sense of remoteness. The Forest Service is committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking and we are more than happy to assist you in identifying these areas. Accurate monitoring data is not available to specifically determine likely changes in recreation use patterns. Please see the Recreation Specialist Report for a more in depth discussion of recreation.
616-1	**Comment:** *Please leave the roads open. It's hunters money that supports all wildlife in this country and many are falling by the wayside because of shrinking public access.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We have found no evidence that hunters will only hunt where motorized access is allowed. We have heard from many other hunters who prefer a non-motorized experience and support our proposals. We believe our decision provides a balance between motorized and non-motorized experiences and believe there will be adequate access for everyone. We encourage you stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM). Please see Appendix B of the Decision Notice for a description of this process.
617-1	**Comment:** *I urge you to stay with Alternative 1 (keep all of the forest roads open). I grew up utilizing forest roads to access remote areas of the forest for hunting, fishing, berry picking, camping, hiking and wildlife viewing. My family continues to use these roads for the same purposes, and it is my hope that I may continue that tradition by doing the same with my children in the future. Without the use of the access roads, my children, and my parents - as they age - will not be able to continue to experience so much of what makes us proud to be residents of Wisconsin. This State's abundant natural resources, and the ability to access them, are the primary reason that I call Wisconsin "home". Please keep the forest roads open.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments; we encourage your continued enjoyment of the forest for you and your family. Please see response to comment 181-3 for a discussion of our project and why we are making these changes. Also note that with our decision Forest visitors will still have access to over 6,800 miles of roads and trails. We believe there is adequate access for all and we continue to strive to find a balance for all. This is an ongoing project and we encourage you to stay engaged. Please let us know which roads specifically are important to you.
618-1	**Comment:** *I strongly support the most restrictive plan to allow motorized use on our national forest. The quiet places are just*

	getting too hard to find! **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. Others expressed similar comments. Please see response to comment 185-1.
619-1	**Comment:** *Please use Alternative 1.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. Others expressed similar comments. Please see response to comment 181-3...
620-1	**Comment:** *I have two young daughters I want to get into the great outdoors, and all it has to offer, these roads allow, both young, and old alike to get back into the great outdoors, and forests, much easier. The main reason I prefer this, is to get away from most of the other people for both safety, and to experience the great abundance of wildlife, without the sounds of too many other hunters, hikers, or similar. Again, please choose Alternative #1, Keep all forest roads open.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing your desire to continue to access the Forest. We believe our decision provides for a balance between motorized and non-motorized use. It also still provides plenty of access for everyone. Our decision provides over 6,800 miles roads and trails accessing the Forest. Please see response to 181-3 for a discussion of why we are implementing this project.
621-1	**Comment:** *I urge you to stay with Alternative 1 (keep all of the forest roads open). Many of today's outdoorsmen are aging; a growing number of them can no longer own suitable recreation land. Many are not able to afford the purchase price and the ever increasing burden of property taxes in order to own these wilderness recreational areas. When you close the roads that provide access to these remote areas you effectively deny access to our outdoorsmen. Therefore I urge Alternative 1. Keep the forest roads open.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and sharing your concerns. We welcome all visitors and their preferences for access. The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with wheeled motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We believe this amount of road miles provides ample access for people while also minimizing the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. We will continually accept specific suggestions for additional road and trails as we update the MVUM. We strive to provide the access people need so they enjoy the outdoors on the national forest. Please see response to comment 181-3 for a discussion of why we are implementing this project.
622-1	**Comment:** *Pls keep all roads in Chequamegon-Nicolet national forest available for public use.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. Others expressed similar comments. Please see response to comment 181-3.
623-1	**Comment:** *I am a life long resident of Wisconsin. I have spent a lot of time in our national Forest including this one. I have used them for hunting, fishing, camping and just enjoying nature. I just learned of your proposal to close some of the forest access roads. I want to register my strong opposition to Alternative 2 and 3. I see no reason in the world why you should do this. I am 71 years old and it is important to me to be able to drive my truck into these areas. I see no problem that is caused by keeping these*

	roads as they are today. There are already large areas of the forest that is wilderness we don't need any more area exclusively for the animals. These areas were set aside for the people of this great country to enjoy. It is not exclusively for the "wacko environmentalist ". Unless you can document factually that great damage is being done by these roads, I feel you are compelled to keep them open as they have been in the past. **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. Our Environmental Assessment documents the the nature and importance of the physical, biological, social and economic effects of our decision. The environmental assessment not only analyzed the impacts to soils, but other resource areas including transportation planning, hydrology, threatened and endangered and sensitive species, wildlife, non-native invasive species, heritage resources, recreation, social and economic resource areas. While many roads do not pose a risk to the environment, some do pose a high risk to further environmental damage. It is these “high risk” roads we want to specifically address as to whether it is appropriate to continue public motor vehicle use.
623-2	**Comment:** *I request to be put on the notification list for any future public information on this proposal or any other that affect our National Forest. Thank you. Ralph Blum* **Response:** Thank you for the information, we have added you to our contact list.
624-1	**Comment:** *I am NOT in favor of any plan that will limit the use of vehicles on roads or trails in the Chequamegon/Nicolet National Forest. Keeping the roads open to ATV and vehicular use will ensure the general public access to our National Forest. Closing roads and trails will only serve to limit use and access to the general public. I am in favor of keeping the status quo or opening more roads.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of the project and our decision.
625-1	**Comment:** *I would like to see no action plan Alternative 1.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of the project and our decision.
626-1	**Comment:** *I urge you to stay with Alternative 1 (keep all of the forest roads open). Many of today's outdoorsmen are aging; a growing number of them can no longer own suitable recreation land. Many are not able to afford the purchase price and the ever increasing burden of property taxes in order to own these wilderness recreational areas. When you close the roads that provide access to these remote areas you effectively deny access to our outdoorsmen. Therefore I urge Alternative 1. Keep the forest roads open.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of the project and our decision. We welcome visitors of all ages to the Forest. We believe our decision provides a balance of access while minimizing the environmental impacts.

627-1	**Comment:** *Please do not close the roads in the forest. We rely on the roads to get my aging family members to their tree stands and retrieve our hunt, or even enjoy the wildlife on a wonderful walk from where we have parked.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of the project and our decision. We welcome visitors of all ages to the Forest. We believe our decision provides a balance of access while minimizing the environmental impacts. If our decision changes your preference for access to the Forest, please let us know. This is an ongoing project where we will be updating our map on an annual basis. Please see Appendix B to the Decision Notice for an explanation of this process.
628-1	**Comment:** *I am a property owner on Hwy X in the town of Three Lakes, in Oneida Co. and am adamantly opposed to closing any roads in the national forest. I use those roads to visit family and friends and other routes would require more miles driven and therefore more gasoline resulting in increased damage to the environment. I also pay taxes for those roads and we should continue to have access to them.* **Response:** You are encouraged to bring your road-specific comments forward for consideration in the annual updates to the motor vehicle use map. Also please see response to comment 201-2 and 241-1.
629-1	**Comment:** *I've lived in Northern Wisconsin for 23 years, and think the closing any of the roads in these national forests is a terrible idea. I've worked as a hunting guide, for Ides Guides Hunting Service in Fifield, WI, since I was 18. Closing down sections of roads in these national forests would severely restrict access to the forests and make it harder for people to utilize these lands. Isn't that what these lands are for in the first place, for people to be able to use? From a hunting perspective, these lands are some of the best Ruffed Grouse and Woodcock hunting areas in the world. There is a reason Park Falls, WI is known as the "Ruffed Grouse Capital of the World," and most of that credit comes from the fact the we have the most amount of accessible public hunting land in the country, for Ruffed Grouse and Woodcock. Closing up 30% of the roads in these forests is pointless, and only detrimental to the public who use these lands. If anything, these lands should be becoming more open to public use, in order to boost the amount of people who are utilizing our National Forests. Our National Forests are some of the most beautiful places in a, and it would be a shame to see them being closed down to public use.* **Response:** Thanks for you description of how you use the forest. We agree that our forest is one of the most beautiful places in America. Administrative access, such as guiding people into the forest for commercial hunting purposes under a special use permit, is outside the scope of this project. Additionally, scientific evidence that concentrating use to less miles of road will reduce hunting or motorized use overall does not exist. It is just as likely that reducing the miles available for public motorized access may increase economic opportunities for local guiding services under a special use permit; however this conclusion is also speculative. Additionally we have heard from other hunters who prefer a non-motorized experience. We believe our decision provides for a balance between motorized and non motorized use thereby providing plenty of access for all. Also please see response to comment 181-3.
630-1	**Comment:** *In looking at the various options it is my request you go with option 3. This appears to have the greatest flexibility for*

	the various choices. Overall, my concern is that the forest service is trying to "block off" large areas for the benefit of the young and fit versus access to an older generation. **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 260-1. Alternative 3 (as modified) was chosen as the decision for this project. For additional information related to the modifications please see the Decision Notice.
631-1	**Comment:** *In my opinion I do no think any roads should be closed in these forests. Access to these lands are a basic right to all of us. I cannot see any solid reasoning to close the roads. It is my opinion that this attempted action is politically motivated. And these types of action are a cancer in our society.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and opinion. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of our project..
632-1	**Comment:** *Support the proposed road closures in the Chequamegon-Nicolet Forest. The use of so many roads only adds to the fragmentation problems of the forest and the probability of introducing invasive species, especially garlic mustard.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment and concern. The spread of non-native invasive species is also of concern to us. Please see the NNIS report in the EA or the CNNF website: http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/cnnf/natres/nnis/index.html for additional information related to invasive species.
633-1	**Comment:** *The roads in the Chequamegon serve two valuable purposes: 1) They provide access to fire fighters in the event of forest fighters. 2) They provide access to average citizens for recreation. National forests are established for the use of all citizens not for an elite few who may have access to horses.* **Response:** Thank you for highlighting this for us. Our decision addresses motor vehicle use for the general public. This is distinctly different from motor vehicle use that is needed to manage the natural resources of the national forest. We term this type of use as “administrative.” Given our decision’s focus on general public use of motor vehicles, road access needed to manage an administrative us, such as fighting wildfires, will not be affected. Please note that most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered “unauthorized roads” – roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the national forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people’s need for that access.
634-1	**Comment:** *I would like to say it would be a shame to restrict further the roads into the Nicolet National Forest. Closing up to 28% of the roads would have a detrimental effect on sportsman. I would ask you keep the 'status quo'.* **Response:** Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the national forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6,800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered “unauthorized roads” – roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the national forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when

	we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people's need for that access.
635-1	**Comment:** *It is our forest keep it open!* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why we are making this decision.
636-1	**Comment:** *As a longtime landowner in NorthEastern Wisconsin. I am in favor of Alternative 1 of the Travel Management plan. However I would be in favor of adding additional trails and roads as I believe the national forest has the potential to be utilized greater for recreation with added access.* **Response:** Constructing new ATV trails was outside the scope of the Travel Management Project. Any new ATV trail projects will be decided by local officials at the District level. We encourage you to contact your local Forest Service official to discuss opportunities for new trail construction. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation why Alternative 1 would be a irresponsible choice.
637-1	**Comment:** *As a tax payer in the United States it is truly absurd that there is a plan to close roads to the public in a national forest to the public they have paid for and now will not be able to enjoy. I am apposed to any plan to closing roads or access to public lands.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We have many laws that apply to this national forest which require us to consider a broad array of resource issues and public values. For every person that wants the Forest Service to do something, there is another person who does not (and vice versa). With this decision, we have attempted to balance all perspectives to provide motor vehicle access while also accounting for resource protection and a non-motorized experience. Please see response to comment 241-1 for an overview of the statutory framework that helps guide us with managing the national forest.
638-1	**Comment:** *Please don't close the roads to this National treasure and limits it's use for us citizens. If you must charge a small fee (tax) for the use of the forest or make it user maintainable.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We are not proposing to collect any fees for the use of the forest roads. Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the national forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6,800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered "unauthorized roads" – roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the national forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people's need for that access.
639-1	**Comment:** *Please don't close any roads.*

	Response: Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of how we chose Alternative 3 (as modified).
640-1	**Comment:** *I vote for "NO change" alternative number one. This is public land; we can't keep locking the "Public" out of it!* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We have many laws that apply to this national forest which require us to consider a broad array of resource issues and public values. For every person that wants the Forest Service to do something, there is another person who does not (and vice versa). With this decision, we have attempted to balance all perspectives to provide motor vehicle access while also accounting for resource protection and a non-motorized experience. Please see response to comment 241-1 for an overview of the statutory framework that helps guide us with managing the national forest.
641-1	**Comment:** *Please consider this email as my vote supporting the closing of 55% of the existing roads and trails in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest. I really hope this goes through. It would be a win win deal, as would benefit both wildlife and humankind.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Since this national forest is public land available to all American citizens, we must account for the values and perspectives people have with this land. With this decision, we have attempted to balance all perspectives to provide motor vehicle access while also accounting for resource protection and a non-motorized experience. We hope that we have properly represented the viewpoints that people shared with us.
642-1	**Comment:** *Please don't eliminate any more natural sights that are left in our dwindling natural resources, it is harder to find these pristine places to show my family what the world was, and should be!* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We strived to provide ample access for people's enjoyment (both motorized and non-motorized) while also limiting the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use.
643-1	**Comment:** *I hunt in this area, and I use many of the back roads. That would suck if they closed them.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We are addressing the growing number of users of this national forest and in particular, those people who use motor vehicles to enjoy the national forest. We recognize that using motor vehicles on the national forest is a legitimate use. The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We are striving to provide ample access for people's enjoyment while also limiting the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use.
644-1	**Comment:** *Let the 4 wheeler & snowmobile clubs use them so we can police them and keep them open for everyone to enjoy.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We have many laws that apply to this national forest which require us to consider a broad array of resource issues and public values. For every person that wants the Forest Service to do something, there is

	another person who does not (and vice versa). With this decision, we have attempted to balance all perspectives to provide motor vehicle access while also accounting for resource protection and a non-motorized experience. .
645-1	**Comment:** *I enjoy hunting in remote areas as well as other related activities like camping and canoeing. I also take of many heart patients who share similar passions. Many of these people are either older or have limited physical abilities. Closing access could be very limiting to these people. Currently, I am in good health. If this changes, then I would also be more limited. I would strongly recommend that closures be minimized. Otherwise this becomes access to a few in the guise of keeping things natural.* **Response:** We appreciate your perspective on how our decision will affect you. We understand that many of our forest users are aging and not as capable to use the forest as they have in the past. Our decision will still provide approximately 6,800 miles of road for public motor vehicle use when you add in the roads under township, county, and State jurisdiction. We believe this provides ample access for people so they enjoy the outdoors on the national forest while also addressing the environmental impacts that arise from this use.
646-1	**Comment:** *I am submitting my opinion that no roads in the Eagle River Florence Ranger District be closed. Since 1900, my family has been involved in advancing the area as well as being stewards of the environment.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We appreciate the interest that multiple generations have in this national forest. We used this perspective to help us understand how to manage motor vehicle access today for the continued enjoyment of future generations. It is also this specific information we want people to share with us so we can effectively evaluate whether to designate a road or trail for motor vehicle use. We strongly encourage people to continually engage us and share their perspectives about access to the national forest with us.
647-1	**Comment:** *I am 77 years of age and enjoy the past time of traveling in and observing the wonders of our beautiful National Forests. The only way I can do so is on my ATV. Closing so many of the roads will eliminate the possibility of myself and hundreds of other aged or handicapped persons from seeing the forest. Please consider my comments in any decision to close forest roads and restrict or eliminate our access.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Our decision results in approximately 49% reduction of available road miles under our jurisdiction (e.g., approximately 2,300 miles). However, this reduction is only part of the total road miles that people can use to access the forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the national forest. The combined total of road miles equals 6, 800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered “unauthorized roads” – roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the national forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people’s need for that access.
648-1	**Comment:** *I oppose closing of any roads in the Chequamegon Forest.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation why Alternative 1 (i.e.,

	keeping all available roads available for motor vehicle use) would be a irresponsible choice..
649-1	**Comment:** *I also agree with Matt and support the closure to the road.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
650-1	**Comment:** *I have looked at several maps from the Medford area and Clam lake areas of the forest. As a hunter and atv owner I am disappointed that I have basically no use for my atv for hunting season. Roads I used to use are now gated that I once was able to drive my truck on, graveled, culverts etc. I am more disappointed that my friend who is handicapped is now denied access to the majority of the forest. Where he once was able to ride his atv (no legs) and join in on the deer hunt and be one of the group. The Fed has said stay home and just sit out the season. I wish you would think about the many elderly, the handicapped and the temporarily injured, broken leg, etc as well as the ill. You have taken an outlet away from them. I cannot see why the Federal Government cannot allow use of more roads within reason during the 9 day deer season. Perhaps this might be done by registering at local forest station so the atv in use and person are accountable. That would not allow other nonhunters to be running. The majority of the joy riders are the ones that damage the terrain by going off designated trails, you just blame the hunters. And set timeframes with quiet hours such as the state of Minnesota does. You cannot use an atv till like 11 am and then not again till close of season each day. At least one can drag a deer out or get a person in and out of the woods.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; we understand how important recreational use of the forest is to many people. Our decision to implement Alternative 3 (as modified) will provide more time allowed for hunting. Roads under our jurisdiction are not the only roads that access the forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the national forest. With our decision, the combined total of road miles equals 6, 800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered “unauthorized roads” – roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the national forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people’s need for that access. With regard to use of the forest for disabled persons, please see response to comment 180-1.
650-2	**Comment:** *There is already a fair chunk of non motorized lands in forest. We all know the Clinton administration was behind this and there is no secret they were anti hunting. This was just a means of decreasing hunters. Public land supported by public taxation yet denied usage. The same thing happens out west, Wyoming checkerboard, tons of public land surrounded by private and no easement to access. Free land to the local landowners, in this case better hunting to the local landowners with limited access.* **Response:** Thank you for your perspective. We are addressing the growing number of users of this national forest and in particular, those people who use motor vehicles to enjoy the national forest. We recognize that using motor vehicles on the national forest is a legitimate use. We are striving to provide ample access for people’s enjoyment (both motorized and non-motorized) while also limiting the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use. With this decision, we have attempted to

	balance all perspectives to provide an enjoyable experience for all users.
650-3	**Comment:** *Then there is the family aspect. When I was younger I recall many trips to the forest where my Dad or Uncle drove down a forest lane which would now be closed, Suring area. We would walk more offshoots to pick berries etc. That could no longer happen as all these lanes unused will just become a mess of brush, broken trees, downed trees etc. What many used for a walking trail will disappear. More people will become lost. How can us hunters and users of these trails keep a pathway to walk on to get back into woods. Will you allow us to get permits to clean up the downed trees? Or whack a trail through the brush and overgrown grass with a machetti to get into an area? I am sure you have seen what mother nature can do the some parts of woods and its just about impassable unless there is some cutting. Even if we use a cart to pull out an animal most of them only work on logging road, offshoots as you call them. And my next concern is most of us forest users park at the ends of these offshoots as most forest roads are not wide enough to park on road and allow safe passage for others. Will you keep the ends open for parking?* **Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. The Forest Service does not typically maintain unauthorized roads. Any user maintenance can occur through a contract or permit. Our regulations (36 CFR 212.6) state that all road construction, reconstruction and maintenance require written authorization. For the public, this is normally accomplished through a road permit. Since we are responsible for management of this national forest, we would specify the necessary road work standards and guidelines in the road permit. With this permit, you would be able to perform the necessary work to keep a road clear of brush and other vegetation. We suggest you contact a local Forest Service office for further details.
650-4	**Comment:** *I do not mind some closures to allow tracts of land that one can walk a couple miles without a car/truck road but we have to still be fair to others that cannot walk. That's where some areas need to have a seasonal access , even if only half of the day. A part day of hunting with friends is better than not at all. Besides its healthy to be outside and to many of those you are taking out of the game might be just what they need, a good dose of fresh air and some majestic scenery and fun times with friends in the forest.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We understand how important recreational use of the forest is to many people. Roads under our jurisdiction are not the only roads that access the forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the national forest. With our decision, the combined total of road miles equals 6, 800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered "unauthorized roads" – roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the national forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people's need for that access.
651-1	**Comment:** *I think it's long overdue. Hopefully the closures will go through. I'm sick of 4 wheelers and lazy hunters. I prefer walking for grouse and truly "hunting" for my deer. Close the roads. Thanks.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Since this national forest is public land available to all American citizens, we must

	account for the values and perspectives people have with this land. With this decision, we have attempted to balance all perspectives to provide motor vehicle access while also accounting for resource protection and a non-motorized experience. We hope that we have properly represented the viewpoints that people shared with us.
652-1	**Comment:** *I believe that all the roads that are kept open the better. The forest is there to be used. Also it is easier to protect the forest with a good road system.* **Response:** Roads under our jurisdiction are not the only roads that access the forest. Other government jurisdictions (townships, counties, State) oversee approximately 4,500 miles of roads that also access the national forest. With our decision, the combined total of road miles equals 6, 800 miles available for people to use wheeled motor vehicles. Most of the roads that would become unavailable for motor vehicle use are currently considered “unauthorized roads” – roads that we have determined as unnecessary to manage the national forest. We have added these unauthorized roads to our system when we evaluated that their risk to resources is less than people’s need for that access.
653-1	**Comment:** *I understand that there is a proposal to limit motorized traffic. I am all for it. I propose to walk that part of the North Country Trail in the near future. This is some of the most undisturbed and pristine land in the country and needs to be preserved as such.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Since this national forest is public land available to all American citizens, we must account for the values and perspectives people have with this land. With this decision, we have attempted to balance all perspectives to provide motor vehicle access while also accounting for resource protection and a non-motorized experience. We hope that we have properly represented the viewpoints that people shared with us.
654-1	**Comment:** *No change - Alternative number one.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; also see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation of why Alternative 1 would be an irresponsible choice.
655-1	**Comment:** *Please don't close any of those roads. As I get older, I can't hike as far back into the bush as I used to. It really gets down to discriminating against any one but those, in shape, back packers. We have a right to motorized access to our national forests also.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We are more than happy to help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We can also direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences, easy access and the sense of remoteness. We are committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking.
656-1	**Comment:** *In regard to closing roads on public lands, I would ask that a balance between conservation and recreation be taking*

	into consideration before a final decision is made. **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We believe our decision provides a balance between motorized and non-motorized experiences and believe there will be adequate access for everyone. We encourage you stay engaged and let us know with specific comments what roads on the Forest are important to you. We will consider them in future updates to our motor vehicle use map (MVUM).
657-1	**Comment:** *I'm very much against closing more roads in our forest. I'm a disabled sportsmen and already am restricted on woods travel. Some of the roads you want to close are my only way to get off the main heavily traveled roads. They are the roads I can hunt and fish on. Please don't close any more roads.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; we encourage you to continue to use the forest for your enjoyment. We are more than happy to help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We can also direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences, easy access and the sense of remoteness. We are committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking.
658-1	**Comment:** *I would have to oppose the CNNF's proposal of Alternative 2. I realize the effort of analysis that went into the Travel Management Project and I thank the CNNF for the thoroughness of their work. I read several of the documents available on the USFS website pertaining to this topic. Limiting access in certain area's by a small variance of miles to create low to no impact areas or quiet areas is understandable, but when you eliminate more than 2500 miles of access to HLV's you significantly impact the public's access to currently available areas.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Our decision designated a network of roads (2,363 miles) that will be available for public motorized use on the forest. Our decision also designated 334 miles of trails available for public ATV use. Please note that this decision only includes roads that are under sole Forest Service jurisdiction. Approximately 4,500 miles of town, county and state roads also provide access to the National Forest. This adds up to 6,800 miles of road that provide motor vehicle access to the forest. We are striving to provide ample access for people's enjoyment while also limiting the environmental impacts from motor vehicle use.
658-2	**Comment:** *I would actually be for increasing ATV travel in "certain areas". I have driven in, camped, hunted, hiked and mountain biked in the CNNF area. I am not for opening up all of the CNNF for ATV access, but I think you should increase corridors in certain areas for ATV use. Since I am a hunter and I hunt with a handicapped friend, ATV access to hunting areas is of great importance to me. I hunt in non-CNNF areas because ATV access to the CNNF is so limited. ATV access for hunting on the available road system within the CNNF should be increased on a seasonal basis or during the fall.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. Alternative 3 was developed partly to address the request additional access during the fall season. We chose Alternative 3 and modified it to include additional roads that were suggested to us during the 30-day

	comment period. Our decision maintains essentially the same amount of ATV trails (334 miles), but also makes available an additional 559 miles of road where an ATV can be used (see page 2 of the Decision Notice). We believe this provides ample access for ATV users. We will continually accept suggestions for additional roads people would like to see be available for ATV use.
658-3	**Comment:** *I support alternative 1 (No Change) if this is the only proposal which does not add to the amount of available use roads within the CNNF. I am not opposed to the CNNF creating certain area's off use to HLV and ATV travel, but the current proposal goes way to far and limits the freedom of the very people who pay the taxes and fees to support the CNNF.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Since this national forest is public land available to all American citizens, we must account for the values and perspectives people have with this land. With this decision, we have attempted to balance all perspectives to provide motor vehicle access while also accounting for resource protection and a non-motorized experience. We hope that we have properly represented the viewpoints that people shared with us. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation why Alternative 1 is a irresponsible choice.
659-1	**Comment:** *I have been a hunter for many years and love the hunting the logging roads, PLEASE DONT CLOSE THEM!!!* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation on how we balanced the perspectives and values people have for this national forest.
660-1	**Comment:** *I support your process and plan. I contend your process and decision will not eliminate access, but protect it by controlling motorized access and all the ills it engenders. I support the alternative which limits motorized access to the greatest degree, as the most sane approach, and the approach that will most effectively honor our commitment to FUTURE GENERATIONS.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We appreciate the interest you have for future generations. We used this perspective to help us understand how to manage motor vehicle access today for the continued enjoyment of future generations. It is also this specific information we want people to share with us so we can effectively evaluate whether to designate a road or trail for motor vehicle use. We strongly encourage people to continually engage us and share their perspectives about access to the national forest with us.
661-1	**Comment:** *As an ATV fee and Hunting fee payer, I am against any trail closings. Our sports have become increasingly costly with less and less ability to enjoy them. I worry about how, when, and where my children and generations after them will enjoy these sports if we reduce access inch-by-inch cloaked in a vale of environmentalism or animal rights or gun control or whatever the current politically correct movement is. Somewhere, somehow it has to stop or future generations will be living in a nanny state where their ability to do and enjoy things is controlled by those who wish to turn our society into a perfect world full of only tree-huggers and soccer moms.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We have many laws that apply to this national forest which require us to consider a

	broad array of resource issues and public values. For every person that wants the Forest Service to do something, there is another person who does not (and vice versa). With this decision, we have attempted to balance all perspectives to provide motor vehicle access while also accounting for resource protection and a non-motorized experience. We used people's comments on future generations to help us understand how to manage motor vehicle access today for the continued enjoyment of those future generations. It is also this specific information we want people to share with us so we can effectively evaluate whether to designate a road or trail for motor vehicle use. We strongly encourage people to continually engage us and share their perspectives about access to the national forest with us.
662-1	**Comment:** *I would like to express my support for alternative #1 of the National Forest Service for the travel management rule in the Nicolet National Forest.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation why Alternative 1 is an irresponsible choice.
663-1	**Comment:** *Plan 1 should be adopted! All people need access to public land!* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation why Alternative 1 is an irresponsible choice.
664-1	**Comment:** *As a hunter who spends time in the Chequamegon and Nicolet National Forests, I am deeply opposed to any road closures as proposed. Deer hunting requires a fair amount of dragging to get the game to the most local road and closure of any of the present roads will make extraction of the deer that much more difficult. In effect, deer hunters will be discouraged from hunting these public hunting grounds and given the State's desire to manage the deer population and the closure of a growing number of lands to hunting, such a move makes little to no sense. If I was faced with the possibility of dragging a larger sized deer to a more distant access road, I would be inclined to not hunt the area and thus the surrounding area would not benefit from my, nor other's, dollars we would otherwise spend in local stores and restaurants. Do not limit our access to public hunting grounds. I oppose any closure of forest roads.* **Response:** Outdoor recreation is about individual choice, including the type of recreation opportunity and the type of access. We can help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We understand that a reduction in available roads is one of many factors that can influence hunter success (for deer, bear, grouse, or turkey). However, our decision does not affect the hunting opportunity on the CNNF. With the exception of campgrounds and administrative sites, the vast majority of the CNNF will continue to be open to hunters. .The roads available for motorized use with our decision could increase the average distance that a hunter would have to walk in or haul bait or a deer stand. Our decision could also provide desirable hunting areas for those hunters who prefer a "walk-in" experience. However, our decision is not expected to measurably affect the magnitude of impact that hunters have in determining the size of Wisconsin's deer population. If there are roads that are not on the MVUM, people will continue to have opportunities to submit suggestions to us to add those roads for a map update. We encourage you to bring road-specific comments to your local Ranger

	District office for consideration in the MVUM.
665-1	**Comment:** *This is just plain silly if you ask me!! There isn't enough hunting land around any more the way it is. Leave the public land available.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Since this national forest is public land available to all American citizens, we must account for the values and perspectives people have with this land. With this decision, we have attempted to balance all perspectives to provide motor vehicle access while also accounting for resource protection and a non-motorized experience. We hope that we have properly represented the viewpoints that people shared with us.
666-1	**Comment:** *You have got to be kidding me! We pay taxes to create national Parks, so we can preserve and enjoy them and support wildlife. Then we paid taxes promote more habitat and reintroduce wildlife and maintain the parks. Then we paid taxes to clear and build roads so we would have access to them to control fires and to harvest game to keep a balance. Now you want to close off some of the roads, to restrict those who paid for it all and I am sure this will cost tax dollars too. If you do this to the taxpayer...why have them?* **Response:** Thanks for your comment. In our decision, we added approximately 371 additional miles of roads to our established travel system. We also decided that approximately 49% of the miles of roads under sole Forest Service jurisdiction will become unavailable to motor vehicle use. Most of the roads that will be unavailable for motorized use are “unauthorized” roads, which are not part of the current transportation system. Many of these roads are only accessible by high clearance vehicles or not accessible at all. However, those same roads are still available to people who choose to use non-motorized means to enjoy the forest (walk, bike, horse). Yet, these roads are only part the total miles of roads accessing the Forest. The townships, counties, and the State have jurisdiction over approximately half of the roads accessing the Forest (about 4,500 miles). Thus, the reduction of sole Forest Service jurisdiction roads equates to 25% of total miles of roads on the Forest. There will be a total of approximately 6,800 miles of roads under all jurisdictions available to motor vehicle users on the forest. We encourage your participation in providing input to the MVUM as it is updated each year. The more specific the feedback, the better we can accommodate your needs and interests..
667-1	**Comment:** *No change.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation why Alternative 1 (i.e., no change) is an irresponsible choice.
668-1	**Comment:** *As an avid hunter of the Eagle River- Florence area of the Chequamegon-Nicolet I am very unhappy with the proposed road closures in Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. Either proposal will restrict my hunting access as well as the access of my fellow hunters. Please consider leaving the access as it is. This forest resource should remain open and available to everyone. By reducing motorized travel in these areas you will effectively cut off forest access for handicapped individuals.*

	Response: Thanks for your comments. Since this national forest is public land available to all American citizens, we must account for the values and perspectives people have with this land. With this decision, we have attempted to balance all perspectives to provide motor vehicle access while also accounting for resource protection and a non-motorized experience. We hope that we have properly represented the viewpoints that people shared with us. We understand that a reduction in available roads is one of many factors that can influence hunter success (for deer, bear, grouse, or turkey). However, our decision does not affect the hunting opportunity on the CNNF. With the exception of campgrounds and administrative sites, the vast majority of the CNNF will continue to be open to hunters. The roads available for motorized use with our decision could increase the average distance that a hunter would have to walk in or haul bait or a deer stand. Our decision could also provide desirable hunting areas for those hunters who prefer a "walk-in" experience. However, our decision is not expected to measurably affect the magnitude of impact that hunters have in determining the size of Wisconsin's deer population. If there are roads that are not on the MVUM, people will continue to have opportunities to submit suggestions to us to add those roads for a map update. We encourage you to bring road-specific comments to your local Ranger District office for consideration in the MVUM. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation why Alternative 1 (i.e., no change) is an irresponsible choice.
669-1	**Comment:** *I am writing in support of keeping maximum road access in the Nicolet. In the spirit of the multiple use philosophy I believe access should not be limited as it will handicap access by a vast majority of users. I also fear road closing will increase fire danger over time. We are at a level where the owners of the forest can enjoy it quite well. Road closure will thwart many users.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. We recognize motor vehicle use as a legitimate use of National Forest System lands under direction mandated by the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960. However, we also recognize the potential for conflicts between users on the national forest. Our decision strives to minimize the potential for conflict by providing a balance between motorized and non-motorized recreational activities. One reason we initiated this project is the recognition that the number of people using the national forest has grown dramatically. In particular, ATV registrations in Wisconsin have increased four-fold in the past 10 years. This change has made it more difficult for us to provide an enjoyable experience for non-motorized users Our decision addresses motor vehicle use for the general public. This is distinctly different from motor vehicle use that is needed to manage the natural resources of the national forest. We term this type of use as "administrative." Given our decision's focus on general public use of motor vehicles, road access needed to manage an administrative us, such as fighting wildfires, will not be affected.
670-1	**Comment:** *I think the roads should be left as is. These roads are not only necessary for hunting & recreation access, but could be the only means for fire crews to stop a wildfire.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. Please see response to letter 181-3 for an explanation why Alternative 1 (i.e., no change) would be an irresponsible choice. Additionally, our decision addresses motor vehicle use for the general public. This is distinctly different from motor vehicle use that is needed to manage the natural resources of the national forest. We term this type of use as "administrative." Given our decision's focus on general public use of motor vehicles, road access needed to manage an

	administrative us, such as fighting wildfires, will not be affected.
671-1	**Comment:** *I support the proposed road closure plan.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment.
672-1	**Comment:** *I am a hunter and fisherman who supports the closing of 55% of the existing roads and trails in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest. I think this would help create more of a wilderness experience for everyone. Thank you.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Outdoor recreation is about individual choice, including the type of recreation opportunity and the type of access. Local Forest Service staff can help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. Our staff also can direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences, easy access, and the sense of remoteness. We are committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking.
673-1	**Comment:** *I am writing to you to express my support for the proposed road closures in the Chequamegon-Nicolet Forest. I am the Chairperson of the Wisconsin Governor's State Trails Council, composed of members appointed by the Governor who represent both motorized and nonmotorized recreation. I am not opposed to motorized recreation but I feel very strongly that the uncontrolled use of motorized equipment and vehicles can reduce the quality of the experience for everyone in our national forests. In addition, we have seen a general degradation of air and water quality and damaged landscapes through the improper use of motorized vehicles. I realize how difficult this process can be and understand the pressure for opening more areas to motorized recreation but the health of the forests and the people who use them is much more important.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Since this national forest is public land available to all American citizens, we must account for the values and perspectives people have with this land. With this decision, we have attempted to balance all perspectives to provide motor vehicle access while also accounting for resource protection and a non-motorized experience. We hope that we have properly represented the viewpoints that people shared with us.
674-1	**Comment:** *I am a property owner on Livingston Lane in the township of Phelps within Vilas Co. and am adamantly opposed to closing any roads in the national forest. My taxes paid for those roads and we should continue to have access to the area.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation why Alternative 1 (i.e., no change) is an irresponsible choice. Additionally, many of the roads that will become unavailable to motor vehicle use are not part of our planned and mapped transportation system. We do not invest any taxpayer dollars into the maintenance of these roads. Plus, these unauthorized roads are typically not advertised and therefore unknown and not used by users from outside the local area. Finally, our decision still allows motor vehicle use on approximately 6,800 miles of road when you account for all jurisdictions (township, county, State, and federal). We believe this provides ample access for users of the national forest. If there are roads

	that are not on the MVUM, people will continue to have opportunities to submit suggestions to us to add those roads for a map update. We encourage you to bring road-specific comments to your local Ranger District office for consideration in the MVUM.
675-1	**Comment:** *I am writing to express my opposition to the closing of any forest roads in the Chequamegon - Nicolet forest. I like to use the numerous unplowed roads in the winter time for snowmobiling. I also occasionally use some of the roads in the summer to access remote lakes and streams for fishing along with fall grouse hunting. Closing the roads will only make a lot of these public resources to difficult to get to for the taxpayers that pay for their existence and want to use them.* **Response:** Thank you for sharing how you enjoy using the forest. Our decision does not address snowmobiling access, thus your use of snowmobiles on the national forest would remain unaffected. However, we encourage you to submit road-specific comments for consideration in the MVUM. We are more than happy to help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. The Forest Service is committed to maintaining both a motorized and non-motorized recreation experience from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking.
677-1	**Comment:** *I am writing to express my support for the road closures in the Chequamegon-Nicolet NF.* **Response:** Thank you for your preference. Many others expressed a similar preference. Please see response to 185-1.
678-1	**Comment:** *I vote "NO CHANGE". I am a slightly built female and without access by un-named or numbered little roads on PUBLIC LAND there is no way I can get to excellent fishing.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 181-3 for an explanation why Alternative 1 (i.e., no change) is an irresponsible choice. We are more than happy to help individuals locate areas that are easier to access, including those where motor vehicles can be used to reach a wide range of recreational settings. We can also direct visitors to more remote, non-motorized areas that are more difficult to access, but offer greater solitude. There are locations that blend both of those experiences, easy access and the sense of remoteness. We are committed to preserving this range of options from which all visitors can choose the type of recreational experience they are seeking.
680-1	**Comment:** *I urge you to stay with Alternative 1 (keep all of the forest roads open). Many of today's outdoorsmen are aging; a growing number of them can no longer own suitable recreation land. Many are not able to afford the purchase price and the ever increasing burden of property taxes in order to own these wilderness recreational areas. When you close the roads that provide access to these remote areas you effectively deny access to our outdoorsmen. Therefore I urge Alternative 1. Keep the forest roads open.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; we understand how important recreational use of the forest is for many outdoorsmen who use our forest. Please see response to comment 181-3. For an explanation why Alternative 1 (i.e., no change) is an irresponsible choice. We understand that many of our forest users are aging and not as capable to use the forest as they have in the past. Our decision will still provide approximately 6,800 miles of road for public motor vehicle use when you add in the roads

	under township, county, and State jurisdiction. We believe this provides ample access for people so they enjoy the outdoors on the national forest while also addressing the environmental impacts that arise from this use.
681-1	**Comment:** *After reviewing the extensive local efforts at public involvement, I can see that you had good input from your local community. It appears, however, that you have missed our Wisconsin members as a community of interest. Many of our members are not local residents but do own property in and around the Chequamegon-Nicolet NF. The NTWF Wisconsin Chapter members are very concerned that they have not been heard through your outreach effort. Please consider extending the comment period for another 30 days to allow them to further review your Travel Management Project EA.* **Response:** By regulation, we cannot extend the comment period beyond 30 days, which ended August 18, 2008. However, we considered all comments received prior to making our decision. It is important to note that our decision includes an adaptive management process where we will accept comments on a continual basis. We are specifically accepting comments related to particular roads and trails people would like to see added or removed from the MVUM. This will be an on-going process. We are committed to continue working collaboratively with all interested parties. Finally, we encourage people to be as specific as possible when commenting and to recognize the map will be updated annually to incorporate comments we receive. Public involvement has been a very important component in how we approached this project. We held 15 open houses in 2007 to solicit public input on specific roads. Ten open houses were held in January and February 2007, five for the public and five for governmental entities. Five open houses were held in October 2007 to present our initial proposal to the public and to solicit additional comments. The Decision Notice (pages 7-9) also describes the process the Forest Service used to inform and involve the public for this project.
681-2	**Comment:** *In the analysis of potential environmental effects, you indicate that you did consider the effects of closing 2500 miles of roads currently used by hunters to access the federal public lands for hunting. You have used the miles of roads open seasonally as an indicator of effects on hunting. While this effort acknowledges that hunters and hunting will be affected, it misses entirely some of our members concerns. Specifically, while this project will not physically block or barricade any of the roads it designates as closed to motor vehicles, it will have the practical affect of makings blocks of public land unavailable to our members. This will be reducing hunting days of recreation for those hunters that are unable to access their favorite spots through non-motorized access. The EA did acknowledge that you are not aware of whether or not the displaced access could be accommodated elsewhere on other public lands in the area.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We understand that a reduction in available roads is one of many factors that can influence hunter success (for deer, bear, grouse, or turkey). However, our decision does not affect the hunting opportunity on the CNNF. With the exception of campgrounds and administrative sites, the vast majority of the CNNF will continue to be open to hunters. The roads available for motorized use with our decision could increase the average distance that a hunter would have to walk in to a particular hunting location. However, this potential distance increase is not expected to measurably affect the magnitude of impact associated with hunting success. Since our decision still provides motor vehicle access on approximately 6,800 miles of road, we believe that all hunters (with motorized or non-motorized means) will have many opportunities to hunt on

	the national forest. If there are roads that are not on the MVUM, people will continue to have opportunities to submit suggestions to us to add those roads for a map update.
681-3	**Comment:** *Hunters from outside your local area bring money with them as they come to your area. If they can't access the Forest to hunt and can't be accommodated elsewhere, they aren't going to continue to hunt on your forest. You have therefore missed disclosing to the public the social and economic effects of closing much of the Forest to hunters. It appears that your cumulative effects analysis didn't include the hunting community of interest that is much larger than just the Forest boundary and the local communities around the Forest.* **Response:** Thank you for your comments. The economic impacts of motorized use in Wisconsin are controversial (see Recreation report). We understand that people easily reach the conclusions you state in your comment. Unfortunately, we did not find any definitive conclusion that supports that our decision will result in an adverse economic effect to local economies. We found in our research that motor vehicle use can benefit both tourism and related dollars to local communities. However, we also found countering costs due to increased law enforcement needs and environmental damage. Finally, we found no evidence in our research that concentrating motorized use on fewer roads will reduce recreation overall. Please see Appendix A to this document for a detailed discussion on the economic issue.
681-4	**Comment:** *I could find no evidence in your EA that you have consulted with the Wisconsin DNR on the possibility of a forty to fifty percent reduction in the miles of roads open for motorized travel have used to access the forest for hunting. How will this project make it possible for them to realize their hunting harvest goals for deer?* **Response:** We have consulted with the WDNR on game management issues, including those that relate to motorized access on the CNNF. .We have engaged many divisions/departments within the DNR to solicit their opinions and perspectives with this project. The project record lists the WDNR as one of the state agencies we consulted.
681-5	**Comment:** *I could find no analysis or comment on the consequences of possible crowding of all the hunters in to the available areas of the possible reductions in harvest and hunting license revenues due to the changes in road management. How does this project consider the consequences of "stacking" additional hunters into already crowded public lands?* **Response:** The designated roads and trails authorized by this decision, along with the non-Forest Service jurisdiction roads, still provides over 6,800 miles of road to travel with motor vehicles (see pages 2-3 of the Decision Notice). We believe this avoids forcing people into smaller areas. We understand that a reduction in available roads is one of many factors that can influence hunter success (for deer, bear, grouse or turkey). However, our decision does not affect the hunting opportunity on the CNNF. With the exception of campgrounds and administrative sites, the vast majority of the CNNF will continue to be open to hunters. If there are roads that are not on the MVUM, people will continue to have opportunities to submit suggestions to us to add those roads for a map update. We will continue to conduct monitoring in cooperation with the WDNR. With this project we are taking an adaptive management approach to management of the MVUM and should crowding become an issue, we will address this in cooperation with the DNR (which controls permits and associated revenues).

681-6	**Comment:** *I encourage you to take a hard look at the potential effects of reducing or eliminating hunting on the areas that will no longer be acceptable to motorized access. As you undoubtedly known, hunting in Wisconsin is a social and cultural phenomenon. I didn't find any evidence that you considered the direct and indirect effects of making large areas of the forest practically unavailable for hunting when there is not alternative capability on public lands in the vicinity. This seems to be in direct opposition to the president's Executive Order 13443, which encourages the availability of public lands for hunting. How are you complying wit this Executive Order?* **Response:** We understand that a reduction in available roads is one of many factors that can influence hunter success (for deer, bear, grouse, or turkey). However, our decision does not affect the hunting opportunity on the CNNF – our decision may change the means of transportation from a motor vehicle to foot or bicycle, but not the ability to access the forest. Thus, our decision does not affect hunting availability on the forest, but rather the means to access hunting opportunities on the forest. With the exception of campgrounds and administrative sites, the vast majority of the CNNF will continue to be open to hunters that prefer to use motor vehicles and those who prefer a "walk-in experience." We believe that our decision complies with Executive Order 13443 to enhance hunting opportunities because we are responding appropriately to all hunting interests. Finally, if there are roads that are not on the MVUM, people will continue to have opportunities to submit suggestions to us to add those roads for a map update.
681-7	**Comment:** *Lastly, I am concerned that this project will have the unintended consequences of making an uninformed hunter subject arrest for traveling on roads that are closed to motorized uses on the MVUM. Your document tells me that it will take some time to get all of the closed roads marked as closed. How will hunters from outside the local area find out about the road closures to be able to comply with them? Have you discussed possible cooperation with Wisconsin DNR to get the road closure information into their hunter information documents?* **Response:** We recognize that some users may not know about the reduced access to some areas of the national forest. Our law enforcement officials and field-going personnel will focus on education and the proper use of the MVUM during the map's first year (2009). They will also help people understand that they can continually provide specific information on roads and trails for future MVUM updates. The Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) will be available free-of-charge at all of our local Forest Service offices and on the Internet. The map will be published in January 2009. As a convenience to the user, we will also place signs at all the roads and trails that are designated for motor vehicle use. We will not be posting any road or trail as "closed." A forest user would use the MVUM and corresponding signposts to determine whether a particular road or trail is available for motorized use. We have approached WDNR previously to possibly include information about this project. We will continue to seek opportunities with WDNR to distribute information about our decision.
2535-1	*William is "all for your road closure."* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. Others felt the same; please see response to comment 185-1.

2861-1	**Comment:** *We will be making several comments on the Travel Management Plan for Wisconsin's national forests, but today I want to comment in the strongest terms possible that the notice of this MASSIVE change in the use patterns for what are PUBLIC lands has been disastrously inadequate. There have been no posting on any of the lands or roads that they are about to close.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We agree wholeheartedly that public involvement is very important with this change in use patterns. We held 15 open houses in 2007 to solicit public input on specific roads. Ten open houses were held locally in January and February 2007, five for the public and five for governmental entities. Five open houses were held again locally in October 2007 to present our initial proposal to the public and to solicit additional comments. The Public Involvement section of the EA (page 5) also describes the process we used to inform and involve the public for this project. In addition, we sent press releases to an extensive statewide media list that includes newspapers, television stations, and radio stations. We will continue to provide opportunities for the public to provide input to the map as it is updated each year. The more specific the feedback the better we can accommodate people's needs and interests. We encourage you to stay engaged.
2861-2	**Comment:** *There have been no notices published in any local newspapers. The notice published in the Milwaukee Journal is a JOKE! Who in northern Wisconsin reads the Milwaukee Journal - you might as well have printed it in the LA Times. The public relations attempts to notify people has been non-existent. Our first attempts to get the word out are met with jaws hitting the table - What? They are doing What?!?* **Response:** Thank you for your comment; please see response to comment 181-2 for a summary of our public outreach efforts.
2861-3	**Comment:** *We would strongly suggest that any attempts to close ANY roads in the affected areas be delayed by at least one year and that each proposed closed road be signed with a notice that "one year from now we plan to close this road - please send comments to." This way each road closing can be reviewed on its own merits.* **Response:** Thank you for your comment. We recognize that some users may not know about the reduced access to some areas of the national forest. Our law enforcement officials and field-going personnel will focus on education and the proper use of the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) during the map's first year (2009). They will also help people understand that they can continually provide specific information on roads and trails for future MVUM updates. The Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) will be available free-of-charge at all of our local Forest Service offices and on the Internet. The map will be published in January 2009. As a convenience to the user, we will also place signs at all the roads and trails that are designated for motor vehicle use. We will not be posting any road or trail as "closed." A forest user would use the MVUM and corresponding signposts to determine whether a particular road or trail is available for motorized use.
3255-1	**Comment:** *Brenda owns a company called Nature's All, LLC. They buy boughs, sheet moss, and other forest products from other folks, for creation of wreaths, other decorative products, and for re-sale to other companies. They rely on the people who collect these products. Do not close ANY roads. Allow collectors to use ATVs to access areas for cutting/collecting. There are many roads where ATVs can be used without causing damage/disturbance. People won't buy bough and forest product collection permits if they can't access the forest using ATV's and/or vehicles. This will affect the economy of the entire area, as*

	well as income the Forest Service makes on forest product collection permits. Business's like hers will go down the drain. Many people would be willing to pay a fee to have a permit to use their ATV to access areas of the Forest for collecting. Collectors need to be allowed and encouraged to cut boughs from trees in logging jobs that would otherwise be cut down or run over anyway. She would like to see a method for monitoring the bough cutting that occurs- set up check stations to monitor if people are cutting boughs properly- educate them- businesses like hers and the Forest Service should work together to ensure bough cutting remains sustainable. It is an important aspect of the local economy. **Response:** We appreciate this perspective on the value of people accessing the national forest and understand that bough collecting is an important activity in the fall. In our decision access for ATVs increased by 71 miles of roads and 16 miles of trails. Please also note, our decision specifically adds roads for fall access. We encourage people to continually engage us to share specific information on roads and trails they use. This information will be valuable to us as we update the MVUM in future years. If there are roads that are not on the Motor Vehicle Use Map, people will continue to have opportunities to submit suggestions to us to add those roads for a map update.

Appendix A

More Detailed Responses to Comments: Recreation and Economic-Related

Administrative Uses are "Outside the Scope" of TMR

Administrative uses are distinctly different from general public use of the National Forest. Administrative uses are those actions needed for managing the Forest. This means that the roads associated with administrative uses, such as timber harvesting and fire suppression, are not being considered in the project. The Travel Management Rule only includes the roads and trails the Forest Service administers as available for public motor vehicle use. This use is typically for recreation purposes and just "getting around" the forest. The CNNF builds and maintains roads for many reasons; the Travel Management Project identifies the Forest Service roads the CNNF will operate and maintain for general motorized use by the public.

Roads associated with administrative uses may not be appropriate or suitable for public motor vehicle use and therefore may not appear on the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) as available for people to drive or operate their motor vehicle (i.e., highway legal vehicles and ATVs). Many people commented that the reduction in miles of road available for public motor vehicle use would have a negative impact on tourism and local economies. These comments indicated that they were thinking of an administrative use, such as timber harvesting. Because administrative uses are outside the scope of TMR, the suggested impacts to local economies are not likely to occur. Administrative uses include:

1. Timber management – the CNNF will continue to manage the National Forest system of roads as needed for the sale and haul of timber resources. This will be accomplished by road construction, reconstruction, temporary roads, decommissioning, etc. These roads may not be available for public motor vehicle use.

2. Fire management – roads needed for the protection of forest resources and public safety will continue to be operated and maintained as needed, although some roads may not be available for public motor vehicle use on the MVUM.

3. Access to private property under special use permit – Roads needed to access private property under a special use permit with the CNNF are not included in TMR – these roads have been specifically designated for only the permit holder's use. Therefore, these roads would be available for public motor vehicle use and not appear on the MVUM.

4. Commercial uses of National Forest lands under a special use permit for earning revenue – People and companies that use National Forest lands to earn revenue are required to operate under a special use permit. Outfitter and guiding for hunting or other recreation activities, people that operate cabins or campgrounds, people collecting boughs, special

forest products, and firewood are examples of activities on CNNF lands that require a special permit. Part of the application process for these permits includes identifying access needs. The potential environmental consequences of the activity and access needs are analyzed for compliance with CNNF Forest Plan standards and guidelines. People that have a special use permit may have roads available to them specifically for their use. Thus, roads under special use permit would not be available for public motor vehicle use and would not appear on the MVUM.

5. Uses of National Forest Lands for Special Events under a Special Use Permit – Many organizations submit applications to hold special events on National Forest lands each year. The people organizing the events may ask and receive approval to use National Forest roads that are not available for public motor vehicle use. Therefore, it is not likely that implementation of TMR would have a negative effect on these events.

The Potential Impact of Reducing the Miles of Road Available for Public Motorized Use to Tourism and Local Economies

The Travel Management Rule Environmental Assessment describes a high level of controversy related to motorized recreation in Wisconsin. Several factors make predicting or describing the Travel Management Project's effects on social values and local economies extremely complex:

- The differences in public values regarding motorized versus non-motorized recreation;
- The wide variety or differences in management actions taken at a state and local level regarding motorized use or prohibitions of use; and
- The lack of specific science-based research on what happens when motor vehicle users are displaced (i.e. can no longer use a road or trail).

Many people responding to the Travel Management Rule Project assume that reducing the overall miles of road available for public motor vehicle use would result in a "direct effect" of less people coming to the CNNF to use their motor vehicles. They believe with fewer roads or miles of opportunities available, people will stop coming to the "Northwoods" or go somewhere else. Many people also assume that what are called "indirect effects" to local economies would also happen if their prediction of less people or tourists were realized. They believe that with fewer roads available, and less people coming to the Forest, there will be less business revenue from people buying gas, food, staying in hotels, etc.

There are two conditions related to the CNNF Travel Management Project that may lead to different outcomes:

1. The physical character of most of the roads not available for public motorized use, and
2. Many of the unavailable roads are not part of a planned and mapped travel system that is advertised and therefore known and used by tourists.

The following paragraphs provide additional information on these conditions.

<u>The Physical Character or Condition of Many CNNF Unauthorized Roads</u>

Most of the roads that are not available for public motor vehicle use are "unauthorized" roads. They are not part of the planned, mapped, and maintained Forest Service travel system.

Saplings, brush, tall grasses, potholes, large rocks, stumps, and uneven terrain can be found on most of the unauthorized roads, making vehicle traffic difficult. Many of the unauthorized roads are simply roadways extended into the general forest area. Individuals, or groups of individuals, have kept these roads "open" for their personal use or for their desire to explore off a well-established system road. Temporary roads created for timber management purposes also frequently become used for motorized recreation. They are usually passable by a motor vehicle immediately after the timber harvest activities are complete. However, ATV use on these roads is not authorized. These unauthorized roads are not maintained to Forest Services standards and most require a high-clearance highway legal vehicle to navigate.

Unauthorized Roads are not Planned, Mapped, or Advertised for Tourism

Unauthorized roads that exist on National Forests are not part of a planned travel system. This means that none of these roads are specifically designed, operated, and maintained for providing public motor vehicle recreation experiences related to tourism. The roads are not marketed on any "sanctioned" Forest Service, Chamber of Commerce, or local government websites or maps. They also do not appear on the maps and websites of the motorized recreation organizations that are close partners with the Forest Service (Note: some of these roads have been mapped by mistake).

The rugged physical condition of unauthorized roads generally appeals to people who like a lot of challenges and taking risks. However, the number of people currently coming to the CNNF for this type of motorized recreation experience (the market segment) is unknown. Motorized recreation on unauthorized roads provides "high risk" opportunities for these users:

- Getting lost because the routes are not mapped or signed;
- Getting stuck or trapped in uneven terrain and other hazards; and
- "Getting caught" by law enforcement for operating a motor vehicle in an unauthorized area.

Therefore, it is difficult to conclude definitively that designating roads as "unavailable" to motor vehicle use will have impacts to the local economies as a whole. The likely effects would be felt primarily by the individuals who have created or maintained these roads for their personal use.

Adaptive Management Approach to Travel Management

The Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest supports sustainable motorized recreation. We work closely with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, local governments, and many different user clubs to plan, create, and maintain motorized recreation opportunities. Our cooperative working relationship focuses on customer demand, local tourism opportunities, and compliance with CNNF Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines. Our intent with these partnerships is to sustain and expand where appropriate the motorized recreation opportunities in the Northwoods. We do so recognizing the contribution to local and regional economies motorized recreation provides to communities.

As a response to public concerns for motorized recreation opportunities, we are using an adaptive management approach to the development and long-term management of the MVUM. We will continue to consult with local motorized recreation organizations; county and township government officials, the State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources about the appropriateness of roads being available for public motor vehicle use. We will also continually accept road-specific requests from private citizens for consideration and possible inclusion in the MVUM. The CNNF staff will continue analyzing people's suggestions using the established criteria and evaluation process outlined in the Roads Analysis Process (RAP). We will continue to request a person's reason (or justification) for their suggestion to add a specific road to the MVUM. Reasons such as a belief that the road is important to local tourism or simply that the road has been an important part of family activities for an individual are values we have heard throughout this process.

Our adaptive management approach to the development and management of the MVUM provides equal opportunity for organizations, governments, and individuals to submit specific road suggestions for inclusion in the MVUM. The CNNF Roads Analysis Process (RAP) provides a systematic, resource-based methodology for evaluating these specific road requests. The outcome of this evaluation is an assessment of the resource risks along with the public value for a particular road.