

FISHLAKE NATIONAL FOREST

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENTS for the FISHLAKE OHV ROUTE DESIGNATION PROJECT

22 September 2004

INTRODUCTION

This document represents a compilation of public comments received between June 7, 2004 and September 22, 2004, for the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project. It includes hand delivered comments from the seven public meetings and comments received through e-mail and letters. We received responses from individuals and organizations in 14 States although most are from Utah. Beaver, Piute, and Wayne Counties provided written comments, but numerous briefings and meetings have occurred with all of the affected counties. Other agency comments came from the Capitol Reef National Park, Environmental Protection Agency – Region 8, Utah State Extension Service, and a Utah State OHV Advisory member. Advocacy groups providing written comments include the Blue Ribbon Coalition, Bullhead 4 Wheelers, Inc., Red Rock Forests, Sand Rock Ridge Riders ATV Club, Southern High Rollers 4x4 Club, Southern Utah OHV Club, USA-ALL, Three Forests Coalition, Utah Forest Network, and the Utah Environmental Congress. Utah Power and Light also provided comments.

METHODS

The processing and analysis of the comments follows the procedures developed by the National Forest Service Content Analysis Team (CAT August 2003). A list of the mail handling procedures and coding structure used can be found in Appendix A. Each sender and letter was assigned a unique identification number for tracking in the CAETv1 ORACLE database. Comments within each correspondence were given a code to group like comments by the type of action requested, the rationale provided, and by site-specific location if referenced. Each individual comment was then entered into the CAETv1 database word-for-word, except for the correction of spelling and minor grammatical errors. As processed, the 198 letters received contained 893 comments. These data were then exported to a Microsoft Access database developed by the CAT team. The Access database allows the user to develop public concerns from the individual comments. The 893 comments are now represented by 67 individual public concerns and are attached in the following report. The public concerns attempt to display unique aspects of the information provided. However, there is unavoidable overlap among several of the public concerns.

The public concerns identified in this report simply characterize what the public told the Forest Service about the OHV Route Designation Project. The Forest Service makes no endorsement or criticism of the content. Since these are scoping comments, the Forest will not make formal responses, but the public concerns and site-specific comments will be used directly by the Forest Leadership Team and Interdisciplinary Team to shape the development of Alternative 3 and any subsequent alternatives. The Forest has however provided formal and informal responses when requested in individual letters.

A separate Access database developed by the Forest is being used to track site-specific comments so that comments can be considered route-by-route as we develop Alternative 3, which will be a modification of the proposed action that is based on updated inventory and public comments.

Thanks is due to Bob Dow, Marry Stewart, Matt Zumstein, and Don Green of the Content Analysis Team for their training and support!

Ellen Daniels deserves a Congressional Medal of Honor for managing the Herculean task of mail processing and data entry.

Prepared by: Dale Deiter, OHV Team Lead

Public Concern

Public Concern Number 101

Public Concern Order 1

Public Concern *The Forest Service should complete a Forest scale Roads Analysis as part of the travel management planning process: a) to comply with agency policy, b) to achieve an optimal transportation system, c) to protect natural resources.*

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
46	1	P	TRANS.4070 0	1	Completion and integration of Roads Analysis (for class 0-6 om) is critical to transportation planning. The travel plan must be developed in the interest of a minimum acceptable route network. It is not adequate to simply place all known routes in the "open" category, then close just a few of them.
161	2	P	TRANS.4070 0	300	I urge the Fishlake to examine the basic, minimum transportation system that's truly needed to accomplish access and management goals, with the aim of reducing road density and resource damage. The Roads Analysis process, detailed in FS misc. publication 643, should be followed closely, instead of simply designating nearly every route "open" that has ever been mapped, GPSed, aerially interpreted, or anecdotally mentioned.
173	25	P	PRCSS.1000 0	165	The Fishlake NF must also follow the direction in 36CFR212. The forest "must develop and maintain a forest transportation atlas." As part of road system management, the FS "must identify the minimum road system needed for safe and efficient travel and for administration, utilization, and protection of National Forest System lands,?" 36 CFR212.5(b) (emphasis added). Accordingly, the Forest Service must conduct a roads analysis as contemplated by the regulations and Forest Service Manual. As stated in the Forest Service Manual, "[r]oad management decision made after July 12, 2001 must be informed by a roads analysis." FSM 7712.5.

Public Concern Number 102

Public Concern Order 2

Public Concern *The Forest Service should have a detailed and complete inventory of routes prior to making travel management planning decisions: a) to perform Roads Analysis, b) to perform cumulative effects analysis, c) to allow the public to influence the decision, d) to determine the value of the route to motorized recreation, e) to maintain motorized recreation opportunities.*

Issue Number

Ltr#	Cmnt#	OrgType	Action	Rationale	Comment
107	1	I	ATTMT.9999 9	510	Enclosed is a map taken from your website which we have filled in the following:1. Roads you were not aware of on your latest map for approval to be left open.2. Existing roads you closed last fall that should be reopened.3. Roads we pointed out to you that should be closed and where signs are needed. We have colored in (Green) roads/trails we recommend to be closed and more signs will need to be put up. As we told Kurt, we will travel again with your workers, if needed, to point out the areas we feel should be closed. Also, we will be happy to assist in putting in the signs, thereby cutting off these newer 'homemade' trails.
173	2	P	NRMGT.301 00	510	During the next few months we intend to supply additional new information about roads and trails proposed for inclusion in the travel plan. Properly assessing and examining such a system could take many weeks of field work. We look forward to seeing how you incorporate our information and comments in the development of the Forest Plan amendment.
173	3	P	ATTMT.9999 9	510	Enclosed: 1. Compact disk containing photos and Excel spreadsheets with UTM coordinates for the photos.2. Printed copies of selected photographs with notes about the pertinence of the photograph to the travel plan amendment.
48	4	I	NRMGT.301 00	30	I have served on the Sanpete County Land Access Committee for the past three years. We have identified every single road and trail on the forest. We have made written comments for each trail such as: when it was created, what it is used for and what kind of shape the road is in. Our final recommendation was to designate the road or trail for specific use and inclusion or exclusion from the travel plan. I'm confident that you have also followed this procedure.

155	4	F	NRMGT.301 00	513	The northern hiking trail shown to Paradise Flats (T27S, R5E, section 31) does not exist nor has it ever existed. Park staff have tried to locate this trail on several occasions and there is no evidence of a trail in that vicinity. We believe that it is a cartographic error and recommend that it be removed from the plan to eliminate
-188	4	I	ATTMT.9999 9	510	Map attachment 1: Map displaying routes missing from FS inventory, route ages, and suggestions for routes to be open and signage needs. Map also shows routes needed to bypass Highway 25.
161	5	P	NRMGT.301 00	510	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. The UFN maintains a database of digital photographs of routes and their condition forest-wide, and is happy to share this information with the Forest Service planners and staff upon request.
173	9	P	NRMGT.301 00	620	He was totally unfamiliar with the trail prior to this visit. His report can be found at http://utah.sierraclub.org/ogden/shoshone/paiute/ . In eighteen photographs and accompanying comments he portrays multiple ORV problems associated with the Paiute ATV trail.
98	9	I	NRMGT.301 00	510	A number of the proposed routes were impossible to even locate, even with a map and GPS in hand, others obviously have had only very infrequent visitation that would hardly justify including the route in your Travel Plan.
194	13	P	NRMGT.301 00	300	We are going to submit additional site-specific comments on individual roads and trails that are being proposed for inclusion in the revised travel plan as soon as possible. We will focus on those routes that are particularly harmful to the natural resources that we believe the FLNF is not currently conserving effectively. This includes wildlife populations, wildlife habitat, soils, water quality, and the severely degraded aquatic habitats across the FLNF. Of course, effects to TEPS and MIS should also be a central concern. We had hoped to have that analysis done by now. It involves reviewing roughly 20,000 geo-referenced photo-points and fieldwork of roads and trails across the FLNF, and will take additional time. With the Ashley, Manti-La Sal, and Dixie and Fishlake requesting detailed comments for their four active Forest Plan revisions, our time for more detailed scoping comments on this project has been limited these last two months, and we will mail those additional scoping comments as soon as possible.

152	20	RM	NRMGT.301 00	620	Suggestions: a) Each road and trail should be inventoried and evaluated on the ground to determine its recreational value and any significant problem areas that require mitigation measures. b) Each road and trail should be evaluated for its value as a motorized loop or connected route. Each spur road and trail should be evaluated for its value as a source of dispersed campsite, exploration opportunities, and scenic overlook destination or as access for other reason.
173	26	P	NRMGT.301 00	510	Accordingly, prior to making this decision, the Forest Service must inventory and analyze classified, unclassified, and temporary roads. FSM 7712.14. Moreover, based on the Forest Service's acknowledgment that "[t]here are abundant examples where unmanaged motorized recreational use has resulted in a labyrinth of unauthorized ORV trails, denuded hillsides, erosion from gullies and ruts, loss or aesthetic appeal, and deterioration of quality wildlife habitat," 69 Fed. Reg. 16889, 16890 (March 31, 2004), the Forest Service must analyze the necessity, enforceability, and ecological soundness of all designated and illegally used ORV trails within the forest if they are being proposed for remaining open.
173	32	P	NRMGT.301 00	131	Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations recognize that intelligent decision making can only derive from high quality information. Information included in NEPA documents "must be of high quality. Accurate scientific analysis . . . [is] essential to implementing NEPA." 40 C.F.R. ? 1500.1(b). Where an agency has outdated, insufficient, or no information on potential impacts, it must develop the information as part of the NEPA process. In addition, "agencies shall insure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussions and analyses in environmental impact statements." 40 C.F.R. ? 1502.24
173	36	P	NRMGT.301 00	51	Survey of proposed additions to the transportation system. Since NEPA analysis must analyze the effects on the actual physical environment Red Rock Forests and the Great Old Broads for Wilderness decided to examine a small sample of proposed additions to the transportation during July 2004. Topographical maps were prepared by the Grand Canyon Trust for most of the 1:24,000 quadrangles on the Fishlake NF. Proposed additions were identified. We decided to focus on the Monroe Mountain area since this seemed to have the largest number of new routes proposed. We were able to identify a number of routes which the draft travel map proposes to classify and add to the travel system. We looked at a number of the proposed routes.

173	37	P	ATTMT.9999 9	510	<p>Attached is a compact disk with photographs of the routes and four spread sheets. Each spreadsheet is associated with a set of photographs. The spreadsheet includes a thumbnail of the photograph, the location with UTM coordinates and notes about the nature of the route. Attached are printed versions of some of the photos with UTM coordinates and notes about the route.</p> <p>Each photograph is also associated with a point on a map. We will provide the maps with photograph locations in the near future. Attached are printed versions of some of the photos with UTM coordinates and notes about the route.</p>
173	38	P	NRMGT.301 00	510	<p>Our survey of routes was essentially random. We did not pick and chose routes. We selected specific areas to concentrate our efforts prior to visiting any of the areas. We also surveyed every single route in a specific area. We followed forest roads or trails from the current transportation system and examined routes leading off those roads that are in the draft proposal for classification and addition to the transportation system. We found the proposed routes for addition to the travel plan fell into a few general categories. - Developments related to commercial livestock production, including stock ponds, fences, and salt blocks. Some routes dead-ended at gates in stock fences. Few if any of these routes served a purpose for the general public. Such routes should not be included in the "open to the public" category of travel routes. Some were incredibly short and provide no recreational opportunity. - Dispersed camp sites, including some obvious hunter camp sites with skinning and cleaning poles. Many campsites had holes or short trenches to accommodate leveling trailers or recreational vehicles. A few camp sites had considerable trash and litter. But other than fire rings the majority were relatively clean with only a small amount of litter.- Routes that are nearly completely revegetated and show no signs of recent use. Such routes do not appear to have a public use and thus should not be part of a minimum transportation system to meet forest needs. - Routes (including current system roads and trails) that show erosion, rutting, widening and braiding. Some eroding routes drain into riparian zones or reservoirs.- Dead end routes with no identifiable destination.- Routes that are redundant and parallel other routes nearby, usually visible from the route. Redundant routes reduce wildlife habitat, increase the level of noise in an area, and serve no essential public purpose.</p>

173	39	P	NRMGT.301 00	510	Comment #35 continued:- Routes leading to reservoirs. Vehicles, campers and trailers were seen at the edge of the water. Such routes decrease water quality, increase sedimentation, and greatly increase the probability of pollution with human waste. Almost every occupied campsite contained ATVs or trailers to haul ATVs. Printed copies of photographs of examples of these types of routes are included as Enclosure 2. Additional photographs are provided on a compact disk. The disk contains three files. Each file contains a set of photographs corresponds to a spreadsheet in the file. The photographs on the CD are in the order in which they appear on the spreadsheets. UTM coordinates are provided for each photograph. The CD is included as Enclosure 1.
173	78	P	ATTMT.9999 9	510	The Three Forests Coalition Comments on the Fishlake National Forest OHV Route Designation Project. Enclosure 2The photographs printed below come from field work performed by Red Rock Forests and the Great Old Broads for Wilderness. The photographs are a sample of photographs supplied to the Fishlake National Forest on a compact disk with comments on the proposed Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project. Each of these sample photographs demonstrates problems we found with routes proposed for classification and addition to the Forest Travel Plan.

Public Concern Number 103

Public Concern Order 3

Public Concern The Forest Service should propose a motorized travel plan that the Fishlake can afford to maintain and monitor: a) to protect natural resources, b) to ensure better enforcement of travel plan rules, c) to be consistent with the Roads Analysis process, d) for public safety.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
171	5	I	TRANS.4000 0	2	2. The Fishlake OHV Route Designation Situation. It is my contention that: b. That trails so identified will neither be maintained nor controlled.
98	6	I	TRANS.4020 0	935	Many of your currently classified routes are desperately in need of maintenance, how can you propose to add to an already under-funded system? Where is the money for the upkeep going to come from?

173	12	P	TRANS.4100 0	935	Can the Fishlake NF construct, reconstruct and maintain the additions in order to prevent undue degradation of the natural resources? What is the projected budget requirement for the additional roads and trails? What expense and level of monitoring and law enforcement will be required for the current and additional routes? How does the Forest determine when it has insufficient staff to ensure full protection of the National Forest ecosystems and full compliance with ORV regulations?
173	20	P	TRANS.4100 0	935	A large number of conservation organizations sent a petition to the Forest Service (attached) asking for adequate management of ORVs. The petitioners noted "according to Forest Service records, the average maintenance cost of ORV trails (\$5,000/mile) is more than six times greater than hiking trails (\$750/mile)." The Fishlake NF intends to add 239 miles of new motorized trail for a total of 555 miles of trail. At \$5,000 per mile that means the Forest intends to add an additional maintenance cost of \$1,195,000 to the cost of ORV trail maintenance. While the Fishlake NF may say that not all trails will require significant maintenance we found that many of the proposed trails will require maintenance or reconstruction to make them resistant to erosion, avoid moist meadows, or move them from a straight downhill fall line. In addition many currently open trails have the same problems. The total cost of motorized trail maintenance could be as high as \$2,775,000. How much can the Fishlake NF reasonably expect for a motorized trail budget annually during the life of the Forest Plan?

Public Concern Number 104

Public Concern Order 4

Public Concern The Forest Service should follow the requirements of the "National Roadless Rule": a) to comply with legal and regulatory requirements, b) to protect roadless areas and potential wilderness, c) to protect natural resources.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

194	1	P	TRANS.4020 0	100	The maps of the proposed action appear to include the addition of many miles of classified road to the transportation system inside Inventoried Roadless Area (IRA-as defined at 36CFR?294.11) 36 CFR?212.1 defines new road construction as, "Activity that results in the addition of forest classified or temporary road miles." In light of this, it seems clear at the proposed action is not consistent, and in some cases in violation of, the Roadless Area Conservation Rule (RACR), the current ID for roadless area protection, and the current administration's general public policy, as outlined in public announcements by Mark Rey and others, that there will be no new road construction in IRA.
194	2	P	PRCSS.1010 0	23	On January 12, 2001, the Secretary of Agriculture issued the final Roadless Area Conservation Rule, generally prohibiting road construction to protect natural values in IRAs of the National Forest System. 66 Fed. Reg. 3244 (Jan. 12, 2001). The Roadless Rule forbids new road construction within inventoried roadless areas, with only very specific and narrow exceptions. 36 C.F.R. ? 294.12.6 The Roadless Rule received widespread media coverage and was subjected to an intensive public involvement process, including public meetings across the West. A record-setting 1.6 million Americans commented on the Rule during the NEPA process, which spanned from 1997 or 1998 to 2001. Roughly 95% of all comments submitted during this long NEPA process favored the proposed protections for National Forest and Grassland roadless areas, which were adopted in the final Rule. Moreover, the public continues its overwhelming support for the Rule. More importantly, the Roadless Rule has been finalized and sets forth the Forest Service's legal obligations for these areas. The Forest Service may not ignore its dictates, including those established in the CFR it has established to conserve IRAs. In the leading case, the Ninth Circuit fully reinstated the Rule in December 2002 after the District of Idaho had enjoined it. Kootenai Tribe of Idaho v. Veneman, 313 F.3d 1094 (9th Cir. 2002). The Ninth Circuit is presently the only United States Circuit Court of Appeals to have ruled on the Rule's validity. As a result of the ruling of the Ninth Circuit, the Roadless Rule is in effect nationwide, with the possible exception of National Forest System lands inside the state of Wyoming. In 2003, the District of Wyoming purported to enjoin the Roadless Rule premised on findings that promulgation of the Rule violated (i) NEPA, despite the fact that the Rule broke records for public participation and public comment, and (ii) the Wilderness Act, despite the fact that the Rule did not purport to

194 3 P PRCS.1010 23
0

enjoin the Roadless Rule premised on findings that promulgation of the Rule violated (i) NEPA, despite the fact that the Rule broke records for public participation and public comment, and (ii) the Wilderness Act, despite the fact that the Rule did not purport to designate new wilderness areas or undercut protections for existing wilderness. Wyoming v. United States Department of Agriculture, 277 F. Supp.2d 1197 (D. Wyo. 2003). That decision is currently on appeal to the Tenth Circuit and the Wyoming injunction applies only to Wyoming, and does not apply to this project. District court rulings in Wyoming are not binding on the District Court of Utah. The Roadless Area Conservation Rule is also the subject of two legal challenges in the U.S. District Court for the District of North Dakota, consolidated as Billings County v. Veneman, No. A1-01-045. No injunction has been sought by the Billings County plaintiffs or granted by the District Court. Summary judgment motions by both sides have been briefed in the case, but the case was stayed by order of the District Court on August 28, 2003, and the plaintiffs and the Forest Service ordered to participate in court-supervised mediation. The case

194	4	P	NRMGT.300 00	100	<p>Following publication of the Ninth Circuit decision, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) issued an official Statement by Undersecretary Mark Rey reinstating the Rule. The Undersecretary stated: "On May 4, 2001, the Department announced that it would allow the rule to go into effect as it now will with the injunction vacated by the court." USDA Secretary Ann Veneman has committed to follow the Rule's protections and USDA has not altered that official policy. In an Associated Press article published May 5, 2004, Undersecretary Ray stated that the administration has not harmed any IRAs and that "[w]e've made good on Secretary Veneman's commitment."¹ Casper Star Tribune, Democrats Ask to Keep Rule Protecting Roadless Forests (May 6, 2004).</p> <p>In relevant part, the Ninth Circuit Kootenai Tribe decision held: "Absent the Roadless Rule, development cannot proceed without constraint. Creation of any road that 'significantly affect[s] the quality of the human environment' will continue to require NEPA compliance, 42 U.S.C. ? 4332(C)." 313 F.3d 1094, at 1110 note 8.- "As explained in the Final Rule, roadless areas contribute to the health of the public because they help preserve the forest system's watershed, the rivers, streams, lakes, and wetlands that 'are the circulatory system of ecosystems, and water is the vital fluid for inhabitants of the these ecosystems, including people.'" Id. at 1121.- "The roadless areas also provide 'important habitat for a variety of terrestrial and aquatic wildlife and plants, including hundreds of threatened, endangered, and sensitive species.' Roadless areas in our national forests also help conserve some of the last unspoiled wilderness in our country. The unspoiled forest provides not only sheltering shade for the visitor and sustenance for its diverse wildlife but also pure water and fresh oxygen for humankind." Id.</p>
194	6	P	TRANS.4020 0	100	<p>The administrative record compiled for the Roadless Rule stands as the agency's most comprehensive survey of the benefits provided by roadless areas. The approved incursions into the IRA for this project would cause fragmentation of habitat and otherwise irretrievably compromise the natural values that the Rule is intended to conserve. "Unlike the resource destruction that attends development, and that is bound to have permanent repercussions, restrictions on forest development and human intervention can be removed if later proved to be more harmful than helpful." Kootenai Tribe, 313 F.3d at 1145.</p>

194	7	P	ALTER.2310 0	100	Interim Directive 1920-2004-1 at 1925.04 adds additional restrictions and prohibitions on road construction in IRA. That ID direction is inconsistent with the proposed road construction in IRA. In light of the above, we suggest that the proposed action be designed such that there is no designation of additional classified road inside IRA, as that is an activity that constitutes new road construction. (See attachment 1 - Wasatch-Cache NF appeal resolution agreement regarding a project that designated an already existing dirt fire road that was unclassified as classified, as this supports our point that this proposed action is an activity that constitutes new road construction in IRA.)
-----	---	---	-----------------	-----	--

Public Concern Number 105

Public Concern Order 5

Public Concern The Forest Service should comply with Executive Orders 11644 and 11989, 36CFR295: a) to comply with rules and regulations.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
66	1	I	PRCSS.1000 0	160	Our family has a cabin in the Fishlake National Forest and we have been enjoying the beauty of the area for more than 50 years. With near great grandchildren, at least four generations have had the fortune to come to know and love this beautiful area. We are concerned that the Forest Service balance motorized access and motorized recreation with other resource values and recreational uses of the forest lands. We hope that those in a position to make decisions regarding ORV routes and trails will follow the federal regulations which state that: - conflict among users should be minimized; - ORV trails should be located to minimized damage to soils, watersheds, and vegetation - ORV trails should be minimized so as to minimize harassment to wildlife. The current Forest Service proposal does not provide for a balanced and wide spectrum of uses - motorized use appears to be the top priority.

98	2	I	TRANS.4020 0	130	<p>I am appalled that so many miles of roads and/or routes are under consideration for addition, or are having their status changed from "closed" to "open", without the environmental evaluations that are required by both the National Forest Management Act and the National Environmental Policy Act. This also seems to fly in the face of Executive Order 11644 mandating the minimum necessary trails for reasonable access to our public lands. The Fishlake NF already has an extensive (legitimate) OHV trail systems and a high road density.</p> <p>Given these, why are you proposing to add so many new roads/routes to the Forest? Are these really needed? Are they conducive to the long-term sustainability of the Forest as required under the Multiple Use Sustainable Yield Act?</p>
55	3	I	PRCSS.1000 0	160	<p>According to Presidential Executive Orders which have been codified in federal regulations, when the forest service is designating ORV routes and trails, the agency must: - minimize conflict among users - locate ORV trails to minimized damage to soils, watersheds, and vegetation - locate ORV trails to minimize harassment to wildlife.</p>
-13	3	I	PRCSS.1000 0	160	<p>According to Presidential Executive Orders which have been codified in federal regulations, when the forest service is designating ORV routes and trails, the agency must: - minimize conflict among users - locate ORV trails to minimized damage to soils, watersheds, and vegetation - locate ORV trails to minimize harassment to wildlife</p>
59	3	I	PRCSS.1000 0	160	<p>According to Presidential Executive Orders which have been codified in federal regulations, when the forest service is designating ORV routes and trails, the agency must:- minimize conflict among users- locate ORV trails to minimized damage to soils, watersheds, and vegetation- locate ORV trails to minimize harassment to wildlife.</p>
18	4	I	TRANS.4070 0	300	<p>Please seek to: - locate ORV trails to minimized damage to soils, watersheds, and vegetation - locate ORV trails to minimize harassment to wildlife</p>

-50	4	I	PRCSS.1000 0	160	According to Presidential Executive Orders which have been codified in federal regulations, when the Forest Service is designating ORV routes and trails, the agency must: - minimize conflict among users - locate ORV trails to minimized damage to soils, watersheds, and vegetation - locate ORV trails to minimize harassment to wildlife. The current Forest Service proposal does not provide for a balanced and wide spectrum of uses - motorized use appears to be the top priority.
-16	6	I	PRCSS.1000 0	160	According to Presidential Executive Orders which have been codified in federal regulations, when the Forest Service is designating ORV routes and trails, the agency must: - minimize conflict among users - locate ORV trails to minimize damage to soils, watersheds, and vegetation - locate ORV trails to minimize harassment to wildlife. The Forest Service should ensure that all of the proposed route designations will achieve these legal objectives.
47	7	I	PRCSS.1000 0	160	Our specific objections are: The plan fails to implement factors that are required by Federal Regulations, such as: minimizing conflict among users; minimizing damage to soils, watersheds and vegetation; and minimizing harassment to wildlife.
63	9	I	PRCSS.1000 0	160	This should be done according to the Presidential Executive Orders issued in the past, and which have been codified in federal regulations. Specifically, when the Forest Service is designating OHV routes and trails, the agency must: - Minimize conflicts among motorized and non-motorized users; - Locate OHV trails so as to minimize damage to soils, watersheds, and vegetation; - Locate OHV trails to ensure minimized harassment to wildlife.
173	13	P	PRCSS.1000 0	160	Does the Fishlake NF abide by Executive Order 11644 Sec. 3 (a)(3)? "Areas and trails shall be located to minimize conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreational uses of the same or neighboring public lands, and to ensure the compatibility of such uses with existing conditions in populated areas, taking into account noise and other factors?" How does the Fishlake NF define "conflicts" with "existing or proposed recreational uses?" What level of off road vehicle use would trigger enforcing this clause?

173 23 P PRCSS.1000 160
0

Executive Orders 11644 and 11989, 36CFR295 and other regulations. How does the Fishlake NF interpret Executive Orders 11644, 11989 and 36CFR295? Executive Order 11644 states:(a) Each respective agency head shall develop and issue regulations and administrative instructions, within six months of the date of this order, to provide for administrative designation of the specific areas and trails on public lands on which the use of off-road vehicles may be permitted, and areas in which the use of off-road vehicles may not be permitted, and set a date by which such designation of all public lands shall be completed. Those regulations shall direct that the designation of such areas and trails will be based upon the protection of the resources of the public lands, promotion of the safety of all users of those lands, and minimization of conflicts among the various uses of those lands. The regulations shall further require that the designation of such areas and trails shall be in accordance with the following-(1) Areas and trails shall be located to minimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, or other resources of the public lands.(2) Areas and trails shall be located to minimize harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats.(3) Areas and trails shall be located to minimize conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreational uses of the same or neighboring public lands, and to ensure the compatibility of such uses with existing conditions in populated areas, taking into account noise and other factors. (emphasis added)(4) Areas and trails shall not be located in officially designated Wilderness Areas or Primitive Areas. Areas and trails shall be located in areas of the National Park system, Natural Areas, or National Wildlife Refuges and Game Ranges only if the respective agency head determines that off-road vehicle use in such locations will not adversely affect their natural, aesthetic, or scenic values.

173 24 P PRCSS.1000 160
0

Comment #22 continued: E.O. 11644 is reflected in 36CFR295. The language is slightly different but does not change the obligation of the Fishlake NF to follow E.O. 11644. We have often wondered how National Forests interpret E.O. 11644 Sec.3(a)(3). The Executive Order clearly states that trails for ORV use must designate "the specific areas and trails on public lands on which the use of off-road vehicles may be permitted?" The Executive Order further states "Areas and trails shall be located to minimize conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreational uses of the same or neighboring public lands, and to ensure the compatibility of such uses with existing conditions in populated areas, taking into account noise and other factors." (emphasis added) This clearly states that motorized areas and trails must be located so that they cause minimal conflicts with a number of uses including "existing or proposed recreational uses." In designating any trail or constructing any trail a number of factors must be considered. In this case the Fishlake NF plans to add 400 miles of unclassified motorized routes without considering the requirements necessary for each one as specified by the Executive Order or 36CFR295. The plain language of this order clearly places ORV use as bottom tier in the recreational use of the Forest. It does not say that other uses are to be managed to accommodate ORV use, but clearly states that ORV use is to be managed to accommodate all other uses.

152	36	RM	RECRE.531 00	300	A more responsible approach, it can be argued, would be to disperse all forms of recreational use and perhaps even open trails previously closed to OHV use. Dispersing all forms of recreational use over a larger area will result in fewer impacts in any particular area. Although it would be referring to recreational activities in an unfairly pejorative manner, it is a variation on the truism that one "solution to pollution is dilution". In addition, EO 11644 has a requirement that based on the monitoring of OHV use, agency heads "shall from time to time amend or rescind designations of areas or other actions taken pursuant to this order as necessary to further the policy of this order." This does not necessarily mean that areas should be further restricted (to OHV use). It can easily be interpreted to mean that in the face of increased OHV use, meeting the three part test could mean further opening roads, trails or areas which are now closed as long as the "considerable" test threshold is not exceeded. In this context it could be argued that the relatively smaller amount of environmental impacts that would result from opening previously closed trails would be far less than further concentrating use in the currently open areas.
152	37	RM	PRCSS.1300 0	2	The EO's requires that damage be minimized, not "effects" as I have all to often read in these "action alerts" mentioned earlier. However, any perceived "damage" must be objectively quantified and measured against possible mitigation and management efforts. This is the key to properly balance recreational use and

Public Concern Number 106

Public Concern Order 6

Public Concern The Forest Service should follow its multiple-use mandate from the National Forest Management Act: a) to comply with the law, b) to prevent exclusive use by one user group.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
157	3	I	PRCSS.1110 0	900	We have all the Wilderness in Utah we need. The land should be for multiple use, for instance drilling oil, so our country won't be dependent on other countries. We have the resources that the lord gave us to use, and we need to use them.
13	4	I	PRCSS.1110 0	1	Please continue to manage within the multiple use and sustained yield management framework.

103	5	RM	PRCSS.1110 0	1	Although the announcement letter of June 7 saying "While it is every American's birthright to use the national forests in multiple use" pays lip service to multiple use mandate set down by Congress, the tone of the document clearly indicates that access reductions are the inevitable outcome of the proposed planning process. This is precisely the wrong direction from which to begin. You have already stated the inevitable result, as predicted above. This taints the process from the beginning and virtually guarantees its culmination in litigation.
160	7	I	PRCSS.1110 0	840	Mr. Flanigan needs to consider multiple use of the forest, rather than limiting use of the forest to a select few.
173	31	P	PRCSS.1110 0	160	The Forest Service must take a hard look at these impacts in the context of its multiple use mandate, which requires the Forest Service to utilize these resources "in the combination that will best meet the needs of the American people." 16 U.S.C. ? 531(a). Moreover, "the American people" must logically consider future generations of American people, and the condition of the national forests they will experience.
152	33	RM	PRCSS.1110 0	100	7. General comments on OHV planning: I) FS is encouraged to promote multiple-use and not exclusive-use. Exclusive-use is the antithesis of public access and recreational opportunities within public lands. Management for exclusive-use runs counter to Congressional directives for management of public lands.
152	42	RM	PRCSS.1110 0	800	Some non-motorized recreationists for self-serving reasons vastly overstate user conflict. The reasonable and equitable way to deal with differences is to accept each other's difference. How else can diversity survive? All of us have a responsibility to accept and promote diversity of recreation on public lands. An unwillingness to accept diversity is a fundamental failing of those who seek to eliminate things that don't fit their perspective. Diversity of recreation opportunities can only be accomplished through management for multiple-use and attitudes that promote tolerance, sharing and coexistence. Behaviors that are non-sharing or intolerant of other recreationists on public lands should not be rewarded.

Public Concern Number 107

Public Concern Order 7

Public Concern *The Forest Service should include County, State, and other Federal land management agencies in the motorized travel plan decision process: a) to assure consistency, b) to assure that local issues are considered.*

Issue Number

Ltr#	Cmnt#	OrgType	Action	Rationale	Comment
65	8	I	PRCSS.1210 0	30	Discussions have been held, people in government have been informed and briefed, BUT, are they involved? Are the city, county, and state governments taking an active part in this planning project? I am glad the USDA-FS has briefed the Utah representatives and senators but have they briefed all representatives and senators. I hope so because I am sending this letter to my representative and senator. This is a NATIONAL Forest, it just happens to be in Utah.
197	10	C	PRCSS.1020 0	30	Thank you for your presentations in Wayne County (to the Commission on June 7 and the public meeting on June 17). Please keep in close contact with the Commission as you proceed with this planning process. This is an issue of great interest to us and most county residents and we hope to stay informed throughout the entire process, preferably through personal contact (as opposed to mailings and especially electronic communication, including website and e-mail updates). If necessary, Brian Cottam can capably serve as an electronic point of contact for the Commission.
152	12	RM	PRCSS.1010 0	30	Suggestions: b) The planning team should look to County and Local Governments as well as individuals and user groups for assistance in identifying opportunities for OHV recreation.

Public Concern Number 108

Public Concern Order 8

Public Concern *The Forest Service should do a better job involving the public in this and other travel management decisions: a) to allow greater opportunity for the public to influence the decision, b) so that the public can understand the reasons why the decisions are made.*

Issue Number

Ltr#	Cmnt#	OrgType	Action	Rationale	Comment
-------------	--------------	----------------	---------------	------------------	----------------

159	1	I	PRCSS.1010 0	55	I approach this letter hoping that it is not an exercise in futility. I wonder if writing it and expressing my feelings about the pending trail system will have any effect at all. I say this because I do not feel that I, nor any other ATV riders has been involved, or, even invited, to have any real participation or input into the process. And, quite frankly, wonder if being allowed to submit this statement is anything other than a token gesture on your part because the law and your department regulations require that you do so. With your PR and community relations resources locally, regionally and nationally, I feel that you could have done a much better job publicizing and inviting participation in this project.
120	1	I	PRCSS.1210 0	820	I said "I would not fill this out", but I will try. You wonder why people do not attend your meetings. Fact #1 - When attending meets over the past several years, the only suggestions given any merit was ones that agreed with your own thoughts. If you are going to ask for input you need to be prepared to make changes even when in your own judgment you do not want to. People will give up on you real fast.
118	1	I	PRCSS.1010 0	23	As a concerned citizen and concerns for the Fishlake National Forest, I recently attended a meeting held in Loa, Utah. I have come away even more concerned than I was prior to the meeting. When the ranger in charge continued to use the phrase "We will do this or do that" I asked an important question - "Who is we?" Is it the national forest service? Local forest service, after several attempts to find out, she responded "we" is me. I have the final word (decision). No one person should be able to have that much power over the land use.
164	1	RM	PRCSS.1210 0	820	As president of the Sand Rock RidgeRiders ATV Club here in Fillmore, I am certain I am voicing the opinions of others as I write this. In the past, we have talked to Bill Wright about trails. He has had quite a negative attitude about keeping trails open. His comment this spring was that they had not yet decided which trails to close this year. There is never any discussion of opening new ones or improving them. We are told that EIP are too expensive to deal with and that makes trails not cost effective, and also that recreation is not a good enough reason to keep a trail open. It is for this reason that I am writing to you. I find myself in an awkward position in saying this about Bill. My husband and I are the co-chairpersons for the National ATV Jamboree in Fillmore and work closely with Bill on that level. He can be most helpful and pleasant at times, so I really don't want to sound Re a complainer. We are just worried about our trails.

142	1	I	PRCSS.1210 0	60	What happened to the so called public land that the Forest Service is paid to maintain for the people? Who are the rightful owners anyway? We don't have any say what they do with it - nor do we have any say any more if we can use it. What happened to our rights? It's supposed to belong to the public but it sure doesn't look like it
111	1	I	PRCSS.1010 0	1	I have enclosed an article that I recently read. It shows that these things are coming from the top down and the citizens have little to say about it. It says hunters favor the plans but not all hunters. In Wyoming, the hunters are outfitters and they want to keep the land for themselves.
163	1	I	PRCSS.1010 0	23	I am writing in regards to public meeting concerning ATV trail closure Fishlake National forest beaver district. This meeting was held to inform the public that 82 miles of ATV trails would be closed. This meeting was for public comment. Instead the format was to sell us on the proposal. At the meeting a forest employee told us that they had personally invited several people to attend the meeting. From the time of the meeting I have learned that all the people personally invited were against ATV's being on the mountain. They invited hikers, horse people, but not one person involved with ATV's was personally invited. I wonder if this was an over sight, or a plan to intentionally form public opinion.
163	2	I	PRCSS.1210 0	23	Mr. Flanigan is proposing closing 82 miles of ATV trails with this public comment. Why have the other trail closures been done without public comment. I would like to know how many miles of ATV trails he has closed while being here. I feel, after considering the fact that it is greater than the 82 miles that he is presently proposing. Should this not also have been considered by the public.
152	2	RM	PRCSS.1010 0	55	Members of the local OHV have very valuable site specific information regarding route designations. Please carefully consider their comments and incorporated their suggestions into your plan.

163	3	I	PRCSS.1210 0	820	Is Mr. Flanigan conducting business for personal reasons without regard for public comment. Or is he only listening to a select group with personal goals. Just like inviting individuals to public meetings to promote his personal opinion. Mr. Flanigan was asked if anything could be done to keep open some of the trails. He replied NO. I have been personally informed by two forest employees that no ATV's should be allowed on the mountain, period. This spring myself and another were on a school trust section driving on a road. Von Gillis a forest employee road a ATV over to us in a threatening manner. He stated that the road was closed and he would personally have it destroyed by next year. When asked where the markers were for the forest he stated up in the trees. We then informed him we knew of one over the ridge. After this comment he relaxed and became more personable.
160	3	I	PRCSS.1210 0	620	Why are public meetings being held for these closures when other trails have been closed without the public's input? There are more people using ATV's to experience the region than any other form of recreation. Existing trails should be maintained and not decreased.
39	3	I	PRCSS.1210 0	1	You didn't have any public meeting when you made the trails. You spent a lot of money to make a trail from Bentenson Flat to Circleville so one man can bring thousands of people on the mountain and make a lot of money - all politics.
38	4	I	PRCSS.1210 0	510	Why were public hearings not held for other trail closures?
160	5	I	RECRE.501 00	620	The reason we are writing you is that the Ranger has already made up his mind. We feel this decision has been made without regarding the national forest users as a whole; rather we feel that this decision has been made in favor of the horseback riders. They are the minority in this area and the majority are being left out. Horses are free to access the entire forest while ATV's are limited to provided trails. The forest service opened all these trails and now they want to take them all away. While surrounding regions are opening up new areas, we are being denied access. We feel strongly about the proposed restrictions being applied. We feel that the forest ranger is not interested about providing opportunity for the majority of people by closings these trails. We are willing to exhaust all options to resolve this problem. We are aware that there have been problems in others areas where the legislature has been involved. We will use any source at our disposal.

186	6	I	PRCSS.1210 0	820	I personally know of several trails closed on this unit without public input or meetings. I was riding about two weeks ago where a zig zag wooden fence was built closing a trail. The fence was open for horses but the ATV trail was closed. This trail was not listed on the public meeting forum. I personally would like to know the amount of trails on the beaver mountain closed without public comment or input and why. The Forest Service did have a policy of multiple use. Has this changed? Has the forest taken a policy of limited access. If so why.
122	6	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	There are many other roads and routes closed that were done illegally by the Forest Service that should be looked at in this proposed motorized travel plan. I for one am tired of giving up access to public land every time there is a new land travel
65	7	I	PRCSS.1010 0	133	Since the USDA-FS has already decided, without the public's input, to closed cross country travel to OHV's, then, routes and travel rules is all we , the public, have left to talk about. This is contrary to the NFMA. The USDA-FS has been attempting to prevent or overrule the public input on the overall policy and development of forest management plans.
159	8	I	PRCSS.1010 0	1	Please give full consideration to my feelings and suggestions, and, if anyway possible at this late date, invite greater participation into the process.
46	11	P	PRCSS.1210 0	1	Thank you for using an open process and the UFN will provide detailed route-specific comments by July 30th.
65	13	I	TRANS.4030 0	160	All of the proposed plans on banning OHV use cross country is originating at the National Level, without proper, legitimate "sound" scientific evidence obtained from environmental analysis or input from the public.

Public Concern Number 109

Public Concern Order 9

Public Concern The Forest Service should collaborate with user groups: a) to help enforce motorized travel plan rules, b) to implement route mitigation and site restoration, c) to improve public trust.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

102	2	I	PRCSS.1400 0	600	Another critical element is enforcement and education. Currently, there seems to be inadequate staffing resources available for this. Any cooperative agreements with local ATV clubs can help to lessen this burden. This type of arrangement has worked successfully in other areas. Adequate funding must also be aggressively sought from Congress. Maybe additional state taxes on the sale of ATV's and on licensing could be enacted to help fund the shortfall.
77	2	I	RECRE.531 11	23	I worked the Rocky Mountain ATV Jamboree for several years and have observed the excellent cooperation between the Jamboree and the folks from the
154	5	I	PRCSS.1214 0	811	The routes that I especially enjoy are up Gooseberry, 7 mile, Great Western Trail, Flat Top, Browns Hole, Piute Trail, Pahvant Mountain, Fishlake area. Heck, the whole Fishlake Forest!!! I believe there are a lot of things people would be willing to do to help the cause if they know about it know I
173	14	P	PRCSS.1214 0	55	If off-road vehicles groups wish to become partners in ORV management they need to develop a history of aiding in compliance with law enforcement. This could be accomplished with the Trail Rangers program or the use of other volunteers. ORV users are the most likely to encounter or observe illegal use of ORVs. How can ORV clubs, ORV manufacturers, and ORV users be partners until there is some real history of cooperation, monitoring, and reporting travel programs? Ultimately the responsibility for monitoring must fall on the Forest Service and Congress. Not uncertain partners.

152	19	RM	PRCSS.1214 0	820	USA-ALL believes successful OHV management occurs when land managers engage in cooperative management efforts. Cooperative management should be incorporated into the new Travel Plan. BLM's National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands (January 2001) states: The public is very supportive of the use of volunteers in the motorized OHV program. Volunteering helps to instill a sense of ownership and pride within the motorized OHV community and promotes responsible motorized OHV use. The BLM recognizes that volunteers are an excellent resource to help in the education of the public, in trail design and maintenance, and in monitoring and patrolling for resource protection. However, to have a successful volunteer program requires a serious and continuous commitment by BLM employees and management.[3] (Underline emphasis added) USA-ALL believes this statement is true for National Forests as well. USA-ALL believes that incorporating cooperative management efforts into the Travel Plan is the best method to instill a commitment from the agency to engage in volunteer management projects. Suggestion: a) The Forest Service should incorporate cooperative OHV management efforts in all of the alternatives.
152	31	RM	PRCSS.1214 0	1	7. General comments on OHV planning: j) FS is encouraged to integrate the Utah State Trail Patrol Program and/or Good Will Rider Program into the Travel Plan.
152	32	RM	PRCSS.1213 0	620	7. General comments on OHV planning: j) FS is encouraged to integrate the Utah State Trail Patrol Program and/or Good Will Rider Program into the Travel Plan.

Public Concern Number 110

Public Concern Order 10

Public Concern The Forest Service should communicate more effectively with the public: a) to avoid confusion and frustration, b) to improve public trust.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

166	1	F	PRCSS.1210 0	131	We commend the USFS for the outreach effort already underway (including the public hearings, previous comments on related projects, and the website) that has obviously contributed to such a meaningful scoping document. The maps found on the website especially provide a clear way for local stakeholders to provide substantive comments, and such up-front collaboration should facilitate early participation and analysis for the DEIS.
69	1	I	PRCSS.1010 0	23	I find it ironic that the Fishlake National Forest website contains an ATV advertisement on it's home page. This "Special Event" advertisement is in fact a commercial that will only serve to encourage greater use, abuse on the Fishlake at a time when reasonable heads are attempting to address the problem created by OHV. My question is why?? Is the claim that "OHV use constitutes one of the greatest threats to our national forests," a false claim? I find the fact that a government entity, the Fishlake National Forest, would provide advertising space on their official website to be a contradiction in ethics and totally inappropriate, if not illegal. Accordingly, I would ask that the ATV advertisement be removed.
67	1	I	PRCSS.1210 0	1	First off I would like to compliment your work and preparation going into this OHV management plan process. Having the maps and information available on internet is very useful as well as the maps and open discussion format of the meeting I attended in Richfield. I was pleasantly surprised at the open approach to the existing OHV trails and willingness to
197	6	C	TRANS.4050 0	620	The Commission desires more information about the designations of seasonal and year-round trail use. Many low-country trails on the map are seasonal while many Thousand Lake high-top trails are year-round. The Commission suspects this is for snowmobile use but more explanation is desired, both on the maps and in personal contact during the planning process. Please contact Brian Cottam or any member of the Commission to clarify this issue.

152 7 RM PRCSS.1211 100
0

Comment: Representatives of USA-ALL often hear the complaint by Forest Service folks engaged in planning activities that public input is simply not helpful to them. Simply stated, federal land use planning isn't easy for the general public to understand and participation could be better if FS provided supplemental information to the public. Suggestions to facilitate meaningful public input: a) Consider taking different approaches to communicate to the public about the planning process. For example, consider alternative communication methods such as posting of major roads entering the Planning Area with notices and updates regarding the planning process. b) Consider posting Roads and trails proposed for closure with signs stating "Road or Trail Proposed for Closure, for more information or to express your opinion please call xxx-xxxx or send written comments to xxxxx." c) Consider a program to inform, educate, and increase the public's awareness of public land management laws, regulation and policy, and improve the public's ability to work within both the NEPA process and the FS planning process. The lack of information, education, awareness of the laws and regulations regarding public land management contributes to ineffective public participation. d) Improve the information on the website. 1) The public may understand FS's management requirements better if the website included a description of their legislative and regulatory roots. FS should include links to legislation and regulation establishing FS's management requirements. 2) FS should include links to the complete definitions found in NFMA and the FS planning regulations (pause now, to enjoy subtle humor), with all of the mandatory steps outlined in law and regulations clearly laid out and explained. 3) A discussion of FS's statutory and regulatory requirements.

152 8 RM PRCSS.1211 100
0

4) A index so that users could be guided to all of the references on an issue or requirement. Perhaps a word search process covering all statutory, regulatory, and manual and handbook material. 5) A complete definition of the mission of the Forest Service as it is set forth in law and regulations. FS seems to often be selective in quoting only part of the definition or of just referring to it with the assumption that everyone has the same definition in mind. This is obviously not the case, especially since it has been quoted selectively by many to promote their own agendas. Clearly setting forth the legislative and regulatory definition would be very helpful in having everyone operating from the same assumption.6) Law and regulation regarding livestock grazing. 7) Information regarding R.S. 2477, and how it does and does not apply to forest roads. 8) FS should provide a complete discussion and definition of Recreation Opportunity Spectrum and how it is applied within each Forest Plan available to the public on their website. 9) The FS should make the criteria for determining ROS inventories open for public review and comment.10) The FS should make inventories open for review and comment prior to the release of any Draft or preliminary Alternatives. Wildlife, vegetation, watershed, proposed wilderness, roadless ROS inventories are becoming increasingly subjective. The FS is strongly encouraged to make these inventories public and to request public review and comment on the inventories prior to formulating any Alternative. 11) Receiving meaningful public comment on issues such as livestock grazing would be easier if the FS did a better job of informing the general public of the laws regarding livestock grazing, as well as the livestock permitting process. This will help the FS to better resolve the controversies

65 9 I PRCSS.1210 20
0

The USDA-FS has cited 7 agencies and organizations, it would seem, but, since there exists a joint US Land Management Team consisting of USDA-FS, USDI-NP, and USDI-BLM, and, the state parks, Utah division of Wildlife, and the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) are all Utah state agencies, we are really only talking about TWO organizations! Why didn't the USDA-FS just say so, instead of listing so many offices of the same organization? Sounds like double talk to me, to make the public think there are many organizations and agencies involved. This is misleading to the common layperson, who does not have a knowledge of the organizational structure of the US Land Management Team. Even my knowledge of the organization is incomplete. As Quoted from: "National OHV Policy & Implementation Teams; On the Right Trail! January 7, 2004 Managing Off-Highway Vehicles".

65	10	I	PRCSS.1210 0	1	<p>FS-FAQ; Why is the Forest Service doing this project now? The Fishlake National Forest administers over 1.4 million acres of public land in Utah. There has been rapid growth in OHV use that was not anticipated when the 1986 Fishlake Forest Plan was written. Our monitoring data show that use on the managed Paiute and Great Western Trail systems has increased roughly 172 percent between 1995 and 2003. Concurrently, OHV registrations in Utah have increased 142 percent from 1998 to 2003 (Hayes 2004). Most of these vehicles are used on public lands (Fisher et. al. 2001, Motorcycle Industry Council 2001). The Forest travel plan map currently allows unrestricted motorized access seasonally or yearlong on 62 percent of the Fishlake National Forest System lands. This is no longer a desirable or sustainable management option given the existing numbers of users and expected growth. Waiting is not a preferred option given the existing level and rapid growth in OHV use that is occurring nationally, regionally, and on the Fishlake National Forest. My Response: Better now than later! I agree. BUT, the figures referenced here by the USDA-FS do not accurately reflect the growth and use of OHV's. From 2001 to 2002 ATV sales have increased by only 9%. Accurate figures for 2002 to 2003 are not available yet, only estimates. The figure of 142% is misleading to most laypersons who do not understand the mathematical relationship of percentages. The USDA-FS has used this method of expressing the growth of ATV's because it utilizes such a large percentage figure and furthers their own desired results. What the figures are actually state is that there are 42% more ATV's in 2003 than there were in 1998, not 142% more. Dividing the 42% over the 5 year period gives an average increase of about 8% per year. That is not as big of an increase as the USDA-FS would like us, the public, to believe. Another misleading and deceptive statement to most laypersons.</p>
----	----	---	-----------------	---	--

65	27	I	PRCSS.1210 0	1	<p>If the trail or road is closed, does this mean it is also closed to other modes of travel? Or will it remain open to all other modes of travel? The statement is not clear on this point. This FAQ creates more questions than it answers. The answer to the question is simply an "assessment of unclassified routes that will result in either the inclusion or elimination of a given route from the Forest travel network". Again, a lot of words for a simple answer. Sounds confusing to the common layperson, and appears to really been meant to be a misleading, misdirecting, and deceptive PR statement. Why can't the USDA-FS just answer a straight question with a straight answer?</p>
----	----	---	-----------------	---	--

65	32	I	RECRE.500 00	610	What do you consider a "user conflict"? What do you mean "undesirable user conflict"? That is a double negative. Of course a conflict is undesirable. Is there a desirable user conflict? Sounds like double talk just to confuse, mislead, misdirect, and deceive the public.
----	----	---	-----------------	-----	--

Public Concern Number 111

Public Concern Order 11

Public Concern The Forest Service should use different definitions for motorized recreation terms: a) to avoid confusion, b) to avoid value judgments.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
118	2	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	I would like to know how ATV is defined! The jeep was the first ATV followed by the 4X4 truck. Why am I at 72 years old locked out & gated out of forest land? I have spent nearly one-half century enjoying this land. It should be open to all motorized vehicles or closed to all! Jeep- 4 wheel drive & 4 wheelers.
13	3	I	PRCSS.1010 0	162	3. Please don't let the Clinton / Gore / Babbitt "Roadless Rule" eliminate the many miles of roads and trails that currently and legally exist within the boundaries of those areas. To call an area which contains legal roads and trails "Roadless" is corrupt, dishonest, misleading and ridiculous.
173	4	P	PRCSS.1210 0	1	What type of vehicle is under consideration? The term Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) is not appropriate. All terrain vehicles (ATVs) and trail or dirt motorcycles are not off highway vehicles. They are off road vehicles (ORV) because these vehicles are designed to travel cross country (i.e., off-road).. If they were not then the management of them would present far fewer problems. Using the term off highway vehicle paints a completely different picture than using the term off road vehicle. A sedan can travel off highway. A station wagon can travel off highway. There are a great many vehicles which can and do travel off highway. But many of these cannot travel off road. The term off highway vehicle is completely meaningless. The more accurate term to use is off road vehicle or cross country vehicle. Since off road vehicle is already in common use, this term should be the term used to describe that class of vehicles designed to travel beyond roads constructed and maintained for the passage

101	4	I	TRANS.4031 0	2	There are a few exceptions that I take issue with and feel strongly about. In the "Frequently Asked Questions" (FAQ) number 18 indicates very few exceptions will be made. Combining this with your definition of an OHV (#14), could result in many management options being negatively effected and could allow outside interests to challenge and stop the forest from doing legitimate business and project. I caution you on the wording of the document. Please spell out that the forest reserves the right to authorize exemptions to this rule as needed. I have seen on other forests the OHV plan used to shut down timber operations, some grazing management practices, mineral exploration and even hamper fire suppression.
118	6	I	PRCSS.1210 0	2	The government including forest rangers should be and I believed it to be true. Government by the people for the people. When did we lose that? I respectfully ask for the official definition of ATV and motorized vehicles being used in the Fishlake National Forest. The cattle, timber and recreation people are affected. We all need to work together.
65	16	I	RECRE.531 20	1	The question is the definition of OHV's, NOT snowmobiles and travel regulations. It is very apparent that the USDA-FS is trying to do a "snow" job. Snowmobiles ARE motorized off-road vehicles whether they are included by USDA-FS in the definition of OHV's or not. An OHV is any motorize, self-propelled, wheeled or tracked vehicle that is, by design, built and used for off-road travel, not on recognized roads. This includes off-road street legal vehicles, off-road vehicles over 50" wide (not street legal), and off-road vehicles under 50" wide which include, but is not limited to, motorcycles and ATV's. Apparently the USDA-FS doesn't mind if an OHV breaks the ice and falls though. It's just one less OHV that the USDA-FS has to deal with.
65	25	I	TRANS.4032 0	1	OHV play areas next to communities DO NOT represent cross country travel in a National Forest. Why is the USDA-FS including play areas? A play area designates an area open to "playing" and is not related to cross country travel. Is the Forest Service considering closing play areas next to communities?
65	29	I	TRANS.4030 0	1	The statement "Cross-country travel will be permitted within designated OHV play areas" is obvious since "play areas" are NOT cross country activities.

173 43 P TRANS.4030 510
0

During June, 2004 discussions with the Fishlake NF member organizations of the Three Forests Coalition were presented with the argument that the FNF was actually reducing the number of miles on routes available to ORV users. The argument seemed to say that the FNF was only adding routes that the public was already allowed to use under the open to cross country travel designation. Permission to travel cross country is not equivalent to permission to create trails & roads. The FNF stated that most of the routes that would be designated were old logging or mining routes. Our fieldwork does not corroborate this assertion. We found no evidence of mining & only very little evidence of logging. Perhaps it is true on other portions of the FNF, but since a large majority of routes are in the Monroe Mountain or Sevier Plateau area we think that claim could only fit a minority of the routes. The FNF claims that it is actually reducing the number of routes available by subtracting the unclassified routes which are not proposed for classification from the total number of miles of classified roads & trails & the number of miles proposed for classification & addition to the travel plan. By using this method of calculation the FNF could actually come up with a large negative number of roads & trails on the Forest. Since cross country travel is permitted, ORV users could travel a route paralleling any route but removed by a distance of two yards, four yards, six yards, eight yards, & so on. The ORV users are also allowed to travel any number of routes perpendicular to all these routes. Since cross country travel is permitted on 62% of the FNF there is an almost infinite number of permissible routes. Subtracting this infinitely large number of possible routes from the current & proposed additions, the FNF would end up with a large negative number of roads. On paper it would not be possible to drive within the FNF since the total number of roads & trails would be a negative number.

Public Concern Number 112

Public Concern Order 12

Public Concern The Forest Service should extend the timeline for completion of the OHV Route Designation Project: a) to allow more detailed review and comment from the public, b) to adequately analyze environmental impacts of the alternatives.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

47	2	I	PRCSS.1220 0	131	DEIS Comment Period: The NOI indicates that only a 45-day comment period will be provided on the Draft EIS. We believe a 45-day period is not enough when dealing with site-specific proposals such as this, because commenters would not have time to do field-checking and resolve issues constructively. A 90-day period is
120	2	I	PRCSS.1230 0	800	Your timeline is not realistic and your timing is very poor. Everyone has trouble this time of the year getting people out because they are many other things they can be
153	2	RM	PRCSS.1220 0	820	After careful study of your maps and proposals, we have concluded that some of it makes sense, but there are a lot of problems we have with it. Many of those were submitted the night of our meeting. We will attempt to list some more specifics here also, but due to the limited time frame we don't feel we could possibly do it justice. We would suggest you extend your study period at least 30 to 60 days to allow us more time to put forth a coordinated effort to identify the important trails.
115	3	I	PRCSS.1220 0	1	Doesn't think comment period is long enough.
118	3	I	PRCSS.1230 0	131	The ranger in charge said the plan will be in place by Spring of '05. This is a very short time for public comment - 6/14 to 7/30 of '04. She couldn't possibly travel every road before spring of '05 as she indicated she'd do, ATV should include jeeps and 4X4

Public Concern Number 113

Public Concern Order 13

Public Concern The Forest Service should not cater to environmental interest groups: a) because they are the minority, b) because they are irrational and/or cannot be trusted, c) because they are not local [do not know the area and/or are not impacted by the decisions made], d) to avoid discrimination, e) because non-motorized users are not impacted to the same degree as motorized users by the decisions to be made.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

168	1	I	PRCSS.1010 0	51	REGARDING THE FISHLAKE NATIONAL FOREST PLAN, I AM APPALLED TO HEAR THAT ONCE AGAIN THE ANTI-ACCESS ACTIVISTS ARE TRYING TO TAKE AWAY WHAT IS ONE OF THE BEST LAID OUT TRAIL SYSTEMS IN THE UNITED STATES THAT MANY FAMILIES SUCH AS MINE SO THOROUGHLY ENJOY. IT IS ABSURD TO ME HOW ONE GROUP OF PEOPLE WITH OBVIOUSLY A LOT OF MONEY AND A LOT OF POWER CAN DICTATE WHAT OTHER FAMILIES WITHOUT THESE RESOURCES CAN DO FOR RECREATION. WE TRAVEL FROM ANAHEIM ALL THE WAY TO MARYSVALE, UTAH JUST SO MY KIDS AND WIFE CAN SPEND A WEEK AWAY FROM THE CROWDS OF L.A. ON OUR ATV'S IN SOME OF THE MOST BEAUTIFUL FORESTS.
93	2	I	RECRE.501 00	620	It appears that some of the extreme "I don't want them there" groups are mobilizing their minions to oppose proper management and substituting no management in the form of removing motorized recreation from the forest. I commend the Fishlake for recognizing this existing use and planning for its proper management.
14	2	I	PRCSS.1010 0	51	I do not agree with SUWA and their practices on road closures. If certain routes need to be closed it should be from good sound scientific reasons not enviro comments from somebody who may not even know the area or even been there.
81	2	I	PRCSS.1010 0	51	Please ignore the OHV hating crowd that simply want to destroy a well thought out plan and further polarize the issue.
96	2	I	PRCSS.1010 0	51	Keep up the good work and please don't let the environmentalist change any of your plans.
77	3	I	PRCSS.1010 0	51	Most locals are acutely aware of the efforts of certain "environmental" groups and some in the Public Service to close or severely limit access to the Public. I wish to urge your office not to be unduly influenced by those (mostly outsiders) who want to close our public lands. I feel that we who live here should have a significant voice in the determination of land uses in this portion of the country. The simple fact is that we live in this area and are the ones who are most impacted by these decisions. In my opinion most closures of public land amounts to DISCRIMINATION! Yes, the closing of public land to OHV's is a blatant form of discrimination against those with handicaps and against senior citizens. (A status which eventually comes to all who survive).

60	3	I	PRCSS.1010 0	51	Please consider the spam you receive from obstructionist groups as mail fraud. This is a substantive comment by a person that has dealt with federal land issues for 20 years and works closely with NFS & BLM.
180	3	I	PRCSS.1010 0	51	Sometimes I will carry a plastic box on the back of my ATV to carry trash out. I think that most of the trash I collect comes from hikers that the SUWA spread along the way to make us ATV riders look bad! The propaganda put out by the SUWA is not exactly correct in most cases or greatly exaggerated to meet their agenda. I snowmobile in the winter and we are getting the same propaganda and complaints from environmentalist that use data that is misinterpreted or far outdated or even made up. A good example of this exaggerated information was demonstrated at this last Supreme Court ruling against the SUWA.
91	4	I	PRCSS.1010 0	51	Don't let special interest, selfish radical environmental groups, that want to lock up this land for only their use to persuade you to change a successful past management plan.
180	6	I	PRCSS.1010 0	61	I definitely think that the use of the National Forest lands should be made at the local level, by citizens in the area that use the land and not by special environmental groups from out of state.
10	7	I	PRCSS.1010 0	51	From all the literature I have read, hard copy and on the internet, it has led me to believe the Forest Service has based most of their decisions on the demands of "conservation groups" that want to ban ATV travel and on studies presented by these groups. A view that discriminates against

152	34	RM	PRCSS.1010 0	27	USA-ALL recently came across several "action alerts" from Wilderness Advocacy Groups encouraging their members and supporters to send comments to land managers regarding OHV management on FS lands in Utah. Naturally, we certainly defend their right to do this, however, we have noted that they have increasingly encouraged their supporters to refer to Executive Orders (EO) and often give detailed instruction on how and what to say regarding the user conflict issue. This appears to be a growing trend with these organizations so we can imagine the planning team may have already received comments referring to perceived conflicts between motorized and non-motorized visitors. We would like to take this opportunity to go over several points regarding this management issue. The Forest Service clearly permits OHV use, while requiring it to be regulated. It is the overriding authority, since constitutionally the Congress has sole power over the management of the publicly owned lands. The EO's cannot contradict law on public land issues because there is no shared constitutional authority in this area.
-----	----	----	-----------------	----	--

Public Concern Number 114

Public Concern Order 14

Public Concern The Forest Service should not cater to motorized recreation users and industry groups: a) because they are the minority, b) because they are irrational and/or cannot be trusted, c) because these are public lands, d) to prevent impacts to natural resources, e) because motorized users are not impacted to the same degree as non-motorized users by the decisions to be made.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
0	2	I	PRCSS.1000 0	55	Comment #013:The OHV groups always talk about "a few bad apples" doing all the damage, but the industry marketing campaigns and lax regulations all encourage this abuse of the land. Please consider the vast majority of quiet, thoughtful people who hope to have access to this land 30 years from now and hope that it will not be covered in eroded trails and buzzing with the latest motorized toy. The OHV users are pushy and demanding because they don't understand how their actions could possibly bother anyone else. Thanks for your consideration.
56	2	I	PRCSS.1110 0	450	Please try to put the needs of wildlife and non-vehicle users at AT LEAST the same level, and not below, those of ORV users.

57	2	I	PRCSS.1000 0	55	Please balance the use not give free hand to ORV/Jeep owners, by the way I own 2 jeeps and don't violate any trail laws or designations.
63	3	I	PRCSS.1010 0	55	I also want to stress that the Fishlake National Forest belongs to all Americans. This means that my voice as an advocate for silent, low-impact recreation and the need for preservation of wilderness and wildlife habitat values as the Forest's primary management focus is as important as the voices of those living closer to the
19	4	I	PRCSS.1010 0	55	This land is my land too, and I want it left natural for me, my children, future generations, the Wildlife, and for the OHV riders who will hopefully someday realize the destruction they are causing and will regret it. They are a minority, a vocal and aggressive one to be sure. They must be controlled in their activities.
100	4	I	PRCSS.1010 0	55	I appreciate your work on this project, and I admonish you to avoid caving in to what has traditionally been a very vocal group, but a minority nonetheless: the organized off-road vehicle proponents.
63	16	I	PRCSS.1000 0	55	The Fishlake National Forest Travel Management Plan should ensure the concerns of quiet (non-motorized) Forest users are given as much weight as the noisier motorized users of the Forest. This is particularly important to emphasize because the Utah OHV community is very noisy and strident in their opposition to balanced OHV management policies and wilderness protection. Please remember that the majority of Americans are in favor of increased restrictions on OHV use on our public lands.

Public Concern Number 201

Public Concern Order 15

Public Concern The Forest Service should follow NEPA requirements including the use of science for the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts: a) because it is required by law, b) to assure that the decision gives proper consideration to the relative impacts and value of each management alternative, c) to meet the requirements of the National OHV Rule, d) to comply with Executive Orders 11644 and 11989, 36CFR295 and other regulations.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

65 2 I PRCSS.1010 133
0

I will use the term ATV & OHV interchangeably. By definition ATV's do not include ALL OHV's, but OHV's do include ALL ATV's. National Forest Management Act of 1976 and subsequent revisions were designed to strengthen Forest Service (FS) accountability. The NFMA established new duties to conserve biological diversity, to ground management decisions in sound science & to ensure extensive public participation opportunities in the forest planning process. All directed at ensuring that the forests continue to be managed using longstanding, sound principles/practices rooted in scientific/public involvement & input. Recommendations of the independent Committee of Scientists, a statutorily-authorized body, have contributed to the development of every change & guided every rewrite in NFMA regulations since their inception in 1979. The NFMA regulations direct ecological sustainability as the priority of the FS; protection for wildlife; scientific oversight of agency actions & most mandatory standards for forest management. The requirement to maintain viable populations of native wildlife is one of the more important safeguards of wildlife habitat. Public involvement/sound science is required in the development/revision of forest management plans & the management of our NFs. NFMA requires the USFS to develop a management plan for each NF/administrative unit, utilizing sound science law detail the requirements the agency must follow in developing the plan. These plans cannot be conceived, formulated, accomplish & put into action without 1st conducting a best possible (within time, budget & present "sound" scientific knowledge) comprehensive environmental analysis, encompassing all natural/unnatural environmental factors, all public activities, all utilization of forest resources & all impacts involved. These plans would be biased, not scientifically valid, discriminating, favoring one activity or another without scientific fact/hard data to reinforce/justify actions taken.

65	3	I	PRCSS.1310 0	1	<p>The environmental analysis is the base reference for completing an EIS. In other words, the planned outcome is required to be based on A) scientific facts gathered by completing an environmental analysis of ALL factors and impacts, and then, B) relating these facts to the 1)desired public activities obtained through public involvement and input, and 2) to the utilization of forest resources, i.e: logging, mining, grazing, etc. Relevant Factors: Natural: wind, water, weather, wildlife, landslides, fires, Rain, % Humidity, % sunshine, temperature, heat Maintenance: firefighters, heavy equipment, trucks, aircraft, etc. Logging - clear-cut, strip, spot, selective; Grazing - cattle and other livestock, Mining - open-pit and underground, Horseback riding, Hikers, Skiers, Snowmobiles, other OHV's/ORV's to include street legal vehicles, Off-Highway vehicles over 50" wide, and Off-Highway vehicles under 50" wide (mainly motorcycles and ATV's). Relevant Impacts: Soil erosion, invasive and/or noxious plant/weed dispersal wildlife disturbance, wildlife habitat destruction destruction of aesthetic value, appearance of user-developed routes. Destruction of Vegetation "trampling and compaction of soils and rare plants, rutting of wetlands? disturbance and displacement of wildlife and livestock, damage to cultural resources, impacts to water quality, riparian and fisheries habitats." Your list of factors and impacts may be different than mine. Mine has just come off the top of</p>
----	---	---	-----------------	---	--

166	3	F	ALTER.2110 0	300	In anticipation of the DEIS, EPA offers the following comments and questions on this Project: The NOI states that 62% of the Fishlake currently allows unrestricted motorized access, and that this percentage represents neither "a desirable or sustainable management option given the existing number of users and expected growth." Cumulative Effects: Please clearly describe/ quantify in the DEIS, through description of the baseline No Action Alternative, how each new alternative will alter the percent of Forest-wide access, i.e. increase, concentrate, or decrease the current 62% availability. Purpose and Need: Please clarify whether the purpose of this Project is to increase OHV opportunities (over the 62%) because of the growth in the industry or restrict access because the current level of associated resource damage makes the activity unsustainable at that level. Cumulative Effects: Please describe, in relation to the Forest road density standard, how the addition or reorganization of trails may effect the landscape when coupled with fragmenting effects of the current classified road system. Some OHV trails may have similar impacts on Forest ecosystems as typical roads since many species will avoid "edge" habitat and/or will be displaced by increased or concentrated traffic. Impacts Analysis: In the DEIS, please discuss impacts of proposed OHV routes to both a) receiving resources/ resources damaged typically by OHV use and b) LRMP land use designations. OHV Policy: Please also clarify how this effort will accommodate (or already anticipates) future decisions for both national OHV policy' and the Fishlake LRMP Revision.
45	4	I	NRMGT.303 00	1	Have an analysis of the ecological impact of each alternative.

65 5 I PRCSS.1310 300
0

My notes, thoughts, and comments on your posted FAQ web site. The FAQ's are from a list of standard FAQ's composed, published, and supplied to all USDA-FS regional offices for use in public relations by the USDA "home office". The standard list of FAQ's are then modified slightly to fit the local USDA-FS regional, state, and individual forests public relations needs. I have seen one problem inferred from these FAQ. All of the information presented here seems to stem from one standpoint, i.e. the factor. In the case of this subject the factor is OHV's. I have not seen a study of an impact, such as soil erosion or invasive plant dispersal. The impacts should be studied as to what is causing it and which factors contribute the most to it on a percentage scale. It is only by studying the impact can you identify the major causative factors. All I have read here is, this impact is cause by OHV's or that impact is caused by OHV's, but there is nothing on what factors cause an impact. How do you know, scientifically, which factor - causes - impacts, until you study what each impact - caused by - factors? If you studied sneezing (factor), you may discover it disperses invasive plant seeds but if you studied invasive plant seed dispersal (impact) you may find that wind is the major culprit and it doesn't matter if you sneeze or not. Nothing in this FAQ has compared, with scientific evidence, other factors to OHV's in the degree of contribution to an impact. This is necessary to valid the statement that OHV's are the cause and not other modes of travel. When you study a factor, you will find that the factor will cause many impacts. But, when you study an impact you will find which factors are most

152	5	RM	ALTER.2110 0	131	<p>Environmental analysis/disclosure must be relevant: Without going into unnecessary detail, Blue Ribbon Coalition (BRC) is very concerned about the approach some land management agencies are taking when analyzing/disclosing effects to the human environment of OHV use. An approach we encounter far too often is one that is plagued by a preoccupation with documenting what impacts vehicle use can have or may have to various resources, at various points in time, while ignoring the relevant environmental analysis. Environmental impact analysis will often include statement after statement regarding various negative impacts of roads/vehicle use; i.e., trampled vegetation, compress soils, increased sediment loading, disturbed wildlife etc. Then, seemingly inexplicably, the deciding officer will sign a finding of no significant impact. How could this be? It is because the impacts of OHV use are often temporary/minor or simply not quantifiable & the conclusion or finding of "no significant impact" is entirely correct. Such a conclusion would not be so seemingly inexplicable if the relevant environmental analysis that led to that conclusion was disclosed to the public. Suggestions: a) The FS should avoid statements regarding vehicle use trampling vegetation/compressing soils, or a statements similar to: "driving a vehicle at wildlife will cause said wildlife to be disturbed" without also disclosing what, if any, the significant impacts to the human environment for any of the proposed actions are. b) Impacts should be evaluated/ disclosed in a fair and unbiased manner & with a relative sense of magnitude. Analysis of vehicle use should be compared & contrasted to baseline data in order to establish a threshold on which the significance of the impacts of the proposed actions can be determined. The absence of a rational connection between the facts found & the choice made has been defined by the courts as arbitrary and capricious. c) Impacts should be described in sufficient detail for the public to</p>
152	6	RM	ALTER.2110 0	131	<p>Fully understand the nexus between the impacts and the conclusions and ultimately the decision reached by the Deciding Officer. d) Analysis and disclosure of impacts of the proposed action must attempt to quantify any significant impacts and their relation to conclusions reached.</p>
98	11	I	RECRE.501 00	300	<p>I can only hope that the Forest will do the required evaluations (and at least document the proposed routes) to prevent the addition of unnecessary and damaging roads/routes to the Forest, and to prevent the easily foreseeable lawsuits that will</p>

173	11	P	ALTER.2110 0	2	Some things that need to be considered in defining responsible off-road vehicle use should deal with some specific topics including but not limited to the following. The following specific issues must be analyzed in a change in the Fishlake NF Travel Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There is a spatial consideration to how "responsible ORV use" must be defined. The limits to ORV use must have boundaries. Those boundaries should include exclusion from wilderness, wilderness study areas, wilderness inventory areas, and roadless areas. o Additionally, road and trail densities must be analyzed, mapped and a responsible network designed. The trail system must be commensurate with the capacity of the Fishlake NF to monitor and enforce regulations. o Where are the physical boundaries to limit off-road vehicle use? What kinds of terrain, habitats, soil types, vegetative communities and other recreational uses should limit ORV use? o Would riding with a dust plume be responsible off-road vehicle use? Dust chokes and kills biological soil crusts and nearby plants. o What is the degree of respect that off-road vehicle users owe to other users of the public lands? o What ecological impacts result from off-road vehicle riding?
173	16	P	ALTER.2110 0	300	Is there such a thing as an ecological system or biological community which is not negatively impacted by ORVs? Does the Fishlake NF believe that wash bottoms are not negatively impacted by ORVs? If so, what research could the Forest possess to demonstrate an assertion that ORVs do not impact wash bottoms?
173	18	P	PRCSS.1310 0	620	Nowhere does the Fishlake ORV route designation report look at, consider or even attempt to assess the true extent of ORV use. In this respect alone the report falls far short of what must ultimately be assessed during the NEPA process.
65	21	I	PRCSS.1310 0	1	Since, there is NO comprehensive environmental analysis encompassing ALL factors and ALL impacts, relating ALL activities and resource use on a percentage scale, your USDA-FS question and answer has NO scientific evidence.
65	23	I	PRCSS.1310 0	133	How is disturbance and displacement of LIVESTOCK an impact on the National Forest? Livestock is NOT a native wildlife, nor are they protected by the NFMA. They are DOMESTIC animals introduced into the forest. They are a FACTOR that CREATES impact on the National Forest.

173	28	P	PRCSS.1310 0	131	<p>Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act - We find it difficult to imagine what kind of document could analyze the effects of nearly 400 miles of new motorized trails and roads and comply with NEPA. Each route proposed for addition to the public travel system must be analyzed according to the values and resources specified in EO 11644 and 36CFR295. The resulting travel plan must also be the "minimum road system needed" to protect National Forest System lands, 36CFR212.5(b)The wholesale addition of nearly 400 miles of roads and motorized trails to the transportation system does not meet the requirements of 36CFR295, 36CFR212, or NEPA. The actual on the ground environmental effects of the additional roads and trails must be analyzed. The National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") requires each federal agency to prepare and circulate for public review and comment a detailed environmental impact statement ("EIS") prior to any major federal action that may have a significant effect on the environment. See 42 U.S.C. ? 4332(2)(C); 40 C.F.R. ?? 1502.5, 1508.3; Idaho Sporting Congress v. Thomas, 137 F.3d 1146, 1149 (9th Cir. 1998) (holding that "[a]n EIS must be prepared if substantial questions are raised as to whether a project may cause significant deterioration of some environmental factor") (emphasis added); Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizen's Council, 490 U.S. 332, 336, 109 S. Ct. 1835, 1839 (1989); Foundation for North American Wild Sheep v. United States Dept. of Agriculture, 681 F.2d 1172, 1177-78 (9th Cir. 1982). The Forest Service NEPA Handbook echoes this statement, requiring the preparation of EISs where "major Federal actions may significantly affect the quality of the human environment." FSH 1090.15, Ch. 20.6(4).</p>
-----	----	---	-----------------	-----	---

173	29	P	PRCSS.1310 0	131	<p>Comment #26 continued: Federal courts have interpreted NEPA to require that, when preparing an EIS, agencies must take a hard look at the potential impacts of a project. See Kleppe v. Sierra Club, 427 U.S. 390, 410 n.21, 96 S.Ct. 2718, 2730 n.21 (1976); Robertson v. Methow Valley, 490 U.S. at 374.The agency's statement of reasons "'is crucial' to determining whether the agency took a 'hard look' at the potential environmental impact of a project." Save the Yaak Comm. v. Block, 840 F.2d 714, 717 (9th Cir. 1988). Reviewing courts must confirm that "the agency decision is founded on a reasoned evaluation of the relevant factors." Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, 401 U.S. at 416, 91 S.Ct. at 824 (1971).</p>
-----	----	---	-----------------	-----	---

173	30	P	ALTER.2110 0	300	To take a hard look at the proposed travel map, the Forest Service's analysis must include, but not be limited to, an evaluation of the impacts of ORV use to: wildlife and wildlife habitat (including management indicator species), cultural resources, water quality and hydrology, soil stability (including erosion), biological soil crusts, vegetation (including invasive weeds), user conflicts, aesthetic values, and noise
173	33	P	NRMGT.303 10	131	NEPA review documents, including EISs, must analyze the "environmental impacts" of proposed actions which include not only the direct and indirect impacts of proposed actions, but also the cumulative impacts of "past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions." 40 C.F.R. ? 1508.7; see also 40 C.F.R. ? 1508.8 (effects include ecological, aesthetic, historical, cultural, economic, social or health impacts, whether direct, indirect or cumulative); 40 C.F.R. ? 1508.25(c) (EIS shall consider three types of impacts, including cumulative effects); 40 C.F.R. ? 1508.25(a)(2) (EISs must analyze the effects of actions "which when viewed with other proposed actions have cumulatively significant impacts"); Shoshone-Paiute Tribe v. U.S., 889 F. Supp. 1297, 1310 (D. Idaho 1994). The discussion of the environmental consequences in an EIS must include: (1) direct and indirect effects and their significance; (2) possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of federal, regional, state, and local land use plans, policies, and controls; and (3) natural or depletable resource requirements and conservation potential of the various alternatives and mitigation measures. 40 C.F.R. ? 1502.16. The direct and indirect effects to be considered include "ecological (such as the effects on natural resources and on the components, structures, and functioning of affected ecosystems), aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social, or health . . ." 40 C.F.R. ? 1508.8. In addition, "agencies shall insure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussions and analyses in environmental impact statements." 40 C.F.R. ? 1502.24.

173	34	P	ALTER.2310 0	2	CEQ regulations provide that EISs shall "provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and shall inform decision makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment." 40 C.F.R. ? 1502.1. "[A]gencies shall . . . [r]igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives . . . , [i]nclud[ing] the alternative of no action." 40 C.F.R. ? 1502.14. The range of alternatives should be developed "fully and impartially," and should not "prematurely foreclose options that might protect, restore, and enhance the environment." Forest Service Handbook 1909.15, ? 14.2 Thus, in keeping with the Forest Service's regulatory obligations, the Forest Service must develop and explore alternatives that limit impacts to "soil, water, vegetation, fish and wildlife, forest visitors and cultural and historic resources." 36 CFR 295.2
173	35	P	PRCSS.1300 0	300	To the extent that science is used to support the agency's conclusions, the agency must "identify any methodologies used and shall make explicit reference by footnote to the scientific and other sources relied upon for conclusions in the statement." Id. Whenever there is incomplete or unavailable information regarding the potential adverse environmental impacts of a proposed action, the agency must note this deficiency and must attempt to obtain the information." 40 C.F.R. ? 1502.22. Courts are instructed to set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions that are found to be "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law." Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"), 5 U.S.C. ? 706(2)(A).
65	36	I	PRCSS.1310 0	1	USDA-FS is NOT adaptable or flexible enough and does not have the desire to address ALL the factors and impacts and rate them on a percentage scale! It has nothing to do with SCIENTIFIC FACT! The only real pressing issue is a complete and comprehensive environmental analysis, encompassing ALL of the factors and impacts on cross country travel. So, ALL factors can be rated, on a percentage scale, to determine which ones are contributing the most impact and then can be addressed and dealt with scientifically.

65 38 I PRCSS.1310 400
0

Please List: the invasive weeds and the noxious weeds in the Fishlake National Forest. USDA-FS has reference a noxious weed problem in Montana, BUT, what are the noxious weed problems in Utah? What are the invasive weed problems in Utah? "Currently, Utah's noxious weed problems are not equal in magnitude to those of many other states." BUT, how big is the problem of noxious weeds in Utah? WHAT KIND OF INVASIVE/NOXIOUS WEED IMPACT IS PRESENTLY OCCURRING IN THE FISHLAKE NF CAUSED BY OHV's? Be specific, citing scientific evidence, obtained within the Fishlake NF, supporting the impacts and factors. USDA-FS has used the terms "invasive" and "noxious". ALL noxious weeds are invasive, BUT, not all invasive plants are noxious. Both are damaging but in different ways, (just like OHV's and snowmobiles).

OHVs have a huge potential for weed spread. What do you mean "huge potential"? What "sound" scientific evidence do you base this statement on? The word "potential" refers to what is possible at the greatest degree. What can be accomplished under guided, strict control in a laboratory will NOT occur in the natural environment outdoors. What is actually possible & occurring in the natural environment is what needs to be addressed. The statement "This type of seed attachment and dispersal is likely common" contains a fatal flaw. This is NOT based on "sound" science, but on assumptions. Do you know what happens when you assume something? You make an ASS out of U and ME. What kind of scientific fact does "is likely" represent? The statement "shows the potential threat that motorized vehicle users can unknowingly bring to the landscape" is also based on assumptions & NOT scientific evidence. What does the USDA-FS mean by "potential threat"? It sounds like they are fighting a war on the public, battling against "WE the People" that has "hired" them to begin with. I have the "potential" to become president, but does that mean I will become president. How does "potential" rate as a scientific fact? Again, this is a lot of misleading, misdirecting, deceptive PR meant to confuse the public. WHERE ARE THE FACTS! Concerning the last sentence of the above answer: "In addition, continued OHV use in an area often reduces vegetation & exposes soil/creating favorable conditions for germination of weed seeds (Burke and Grime 1996, Hobbs and Heunneke 1992)." If OHV use is occasional then the statement bares merit, BUT, if the OHV use is continuous, as stated, then, the soil will become compacted & it will be difficult for ANY plant to take root & survive under the wheels of an OHV. The chances of an invasive weed to grow would be slim to none! Invasive Plant Dispersal Impact as related to ATV cross country travel.

65 42 I PRCSS.1310 400
0

Invasive Plant Dispersal Study An attempt to reference a study of the dispersal of seeds of one species of invasive plant by & utilizing a street legal truck on a road, to, the dispersal of all species of invasive plants by ATV's on trails & cross country is not only invalid, but absurd. Each plant species has to be studied and evaluated individually. Plants, through evolution, have developed many varied natural means of dispersing seeds. Examples: Some plants utilize mechanical means attaching themselves to a passing animal; some have developed an ingestive means being consumed by an animal and then passed in their waste; others have developed a natural weather means of dispersal such as wind & are simply blown or float through the air. Plant seeds also come in many sizes and shapes. Some are very small like the mustard seed & will not adhere or be held to almost any surface with or without grooves. Has the USDA-FS identified each & every invasive plant species in the National Forest, determined their natural means of dispersal, & plotted their locations along with the directions in which they have a tendency to spread? The knapweed plant seeds used in the study: 1644 knapweed seeds total; 86% of the seeds came off the tire before going 1 mile = 1414 seeds 14% of them remaining after 1 mile = 230 seeds 8% of them remaining after 10 miles = 131 seeds. How many of the remaining seeds were damaged? What is the chances of the remaining seeds to produce a plant? The Biology of Plant seeds: What is the percentage of viable seeds in the natural environment? On the average, in the natural environment, what percent of the seeds survive to produce a plant? (Taking into account non-viable seeds, seeds consumed by animals, seeds that fall on non-productive ground, seeds damaged in distribution, etc.) In the natural environment, how many seeds, on the average, does it require to produce one plant?

65 43 I PRCSS.1310 400
0

(Taking into account non-viable seeds, seeds consumed by animals, seeds that fall on non-productive ground, seeds damaged in distribution, etc.) In the natural environment, how many seeds, on the average, does it require to produce one plant? What is the evolutionary physiological development of the plant seed for natural disbursement? What is the physical measurements (size) of the plant seed? What is the physical characteristic of the plant seed coat or shell? (rough, smooth, waxy, greasy, hairy, spiny, etc.) Referring to the road surface used in the study: What was the physical characteristics of the road surface upon which the truck traveled during the study? The trail or cross country surface is considerably rougher than a road surface, causing considerably more bounce of the vehicle. The movement and inertia of the bouncing vehicle traversing the rough surface of a trail or cross country will dislodge debris and plant seeds at a much greater rate than traveling on a road. In addition, the inflation pressure of the tires between the truck and an ATV is considerable. The truck tire has a much higher pressure for street or highway travel, making the tire less flexible, not being designed to act as a shock absorber as is the ATV tire. This flexibility of the ATV tire means that it bends and flexes causing the ejection of debris and plant seeds much more readily than a truck tire. The ATV tire characteristics and design do not allow the tire to "hold" debris as in a truck tire. The width of the groove and the fact that the groove runs perpendicular to the spin of the tire throws debris off of the tire. The truck tires, on the other hand, generally have tread grooves that run parallel to the spin of the tire and are considerably smaller allowing the tire to "hold" debris. A simple test to this is to try spinning a truck tire in mud and then try spinning an ATV tire in mud. The truck tire will have the grooves

65 44 I PRCSS.1310 400
0

But the ATV tire will sling mud, clearing the grooves for traction, the mechanism that causes an ATV to dig ruts. Referring to the truck tires used in the study: What was the characteristics of the tires on the truck used in the study? Construction Type: radial ply, bias ply. General Style of Tire: highway, highway/off road, mud tire, snow tire, off road tire, passenger car tire, truck tire, ATV Tire Tread Width Tread height or Groove Depth Groove Width Tire Diameter (not the wheel); Tire Width Tire Surface Area Tire inflation. Relative Ability of the Tire to "hold" debris, in percentage of surface area, after specified number of rotations of the tire or specified distance.

173	44	P	PRCSS.1310 0	131	The objective of forest planning is to determine which routes should become part of the classified travel system. Blanket acceptance of a seemingly random number of unclassified routes or miles of routes does not meet the requirements for analysis under NEPA.
-----	----	---	-----------------	-----	---

Public Concern Number 202

Public Concern Order 16

Public Concern The Forest Service should consider other alternatives in addition to the proposed action: a) the Three Forest Coalition proposed motorized travel plan for the Fishlake Forest, b) Three Forest Coalition Forest Plan Standards, c) designate no motorized trails or new classified roads within UEC proposed wilderness areas, d) maximize motorized recreation, e) a conservation biology alternative, f) eliminate all motorized recreation alternative, g) close the forest to motorized cross-country travel first, then designate a system, h) stop most uses and management of National Forests, i) alternatives that addresses wolf recovery and reintroduction, j) to be consistent with NEPA requirements.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
-------------	--------------	----------------	---------------	------------------	----------------

173	-1	P	ALTER.2330 0	131	Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project. Red Rock Forests, The Grand Canyon Trust, the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, the Sierra Club, the Great Old Broads for Wilderness as organizations participating in Three Forests Coalition submit the following comments on the proposal. We recognize that the proposed plan is still in the scoping phase of a NEPA process. This is an extensive plan revision and we are not sure that every issue we believe needs to be addressed is covered in our comments. We believe that the Fishlake National Forest has expertise in developing and defining issues for scoping purposes many of which we will not have identified. Our comments are fairly comprehensive for scoping comments. Included in the comments is the latest version of appropriate sections of our Sustainable Multiple Use (SMU) Forest Plan. This alternative meets the requirements for being a reasonable alternative and also addresses issues pertinent to the purpose and need for the Forest Plan amendment. We expect that you will include this alternative as one among others for public analysis and comment during the upcoming NEPA process of developing a travel plan: The Notice of Intent (NOI) makes this provision for possible alternatives: All alternatives studied in detail must fall within the scope of the purpose and need for action and will generally tier to and comply with the Fishlake forest plan. The added restrictions on motorized cross-country travel are the only proposed amendments to the forest plan at this time. The Three Forests Coalition SMU Forest Plan meets the criteria specified. The Three Forests Coalition will appreciate the opportunity to adapt the alternative to the specific format that will be used in the Draft EIS.
45	1	I	ALTER.2340 0	1	Will there be a conservation biology alternative?
106	2	I	ALTER.2330 0	51	Conservation Alternative I You will soon be receiving a travel plan alternative proposal from the Redrock Forests and other Utah citizen groups. Please give this your consideration and incorporated it in your final travel plan. Citizens who care sincerely about the land are devoting their, volunteer: efforts and considerable expertise to this proposal.
17	2	I	NRMGT.300 00	2	I also think the EIS should include the following banned things in this area:1-no hunting2-no trapping3-no new road and let some present roads go back to nature4-no pwcs, snowmobiles or atvs5-no burning since air particulates cause asthma, cancer and heart attacks6-no mining7-no logging8-no drilling9-no grazing

45	3	I	ALTER.2110 0	440	Consider the recolonization of wolves in the OHV route policy.
153	4	RM	ALTER.2110 0	510	We would propose that you immediately implement a travel plan to stay on existing roads and trails (no cross country travel) and postpone making the final route map until we can better study the proposal
152	4	RM	ALTER.2310 0	1	The Forest Service should develop an Alternative that maximizes motorized recreation The Forest Service is required to develop a wide range of Alternatives. The Planning Team is encouraged to formulate at least one Alternative that emphasizes and maximizes use of Roaded Natural and Semi-Primitive Motorized opportunity settings for recreation.
108	4	I	ALTER.2110 0	2	In the future, all ORV use should be eliminated from the Fishlake NF. An area with the third highest mountain range in Utah and such excellent country and wildlife deserves so much better
47	8	I	ALTER.2330 0	1	Conservation Proposal: We are aware that a citizens' coalition coordinated by Redrock Forests is developing an alternative travel plan proposal that soon will be presented to the Forest Service. We ask you to adopt that proposal and analyze it in the EIS.

194	8	P	ALTER.2340 0	2	<p>UEC Citizen's National Forest Wilderness Proposal - Our state-wide citizen's wilderness proposal for National Forest lands in the state of Utah may be introduced as a new piece of legislation in the next session of Congress. The maps of the current draft proposed action for this project include scores of miles of both classified road and designated ATV trails inside the boundaries of these proposed wilderness areas on the Fishlake National Forest (FLNF). We have already submitted GIS coverage of our wilderness proposal to you for consideration in the development of this travel plan revision when you met with us this summer in Salt Lake City. We incorporate that GIS by reference into these comments. The development of our wilderness proposal included a multi-year, detailed evaluation of the condition, use level, and environmental appropriateness (impacts to soils, water, wildlife habitat and populations) of the hundreds of miles of user created, constructed, legal, and illegal roads and trails that are located inside the boundaries of each proposed wilderness unit, state wide. On the FLNF this included scores of miles of designated and illegal ATV trails. Those that are located inside the boundaries of our wilderness proposal are not the product of oversight of lack of consideration. Rather, each road and trail that is included in our wilderness proposal was left in after site-specific consideration and balancing of factors including: levels of use (whether legal or illegal), location on erosive soils, steep eroding slopes, frequency of stream crossings, damage to riparian habitat, excessive fragmentation of critical elk calving grounds, fragmentation of the limited secure big game winter range, and impacts to TEPS species and their habitat, along with a consideration of the increasing public need for more representation of designated wilderness areas in Utah and the Fishlake NF specifically.</p>
-----	---	---	-----------------	---	---

194	9	P	ALTER.2340 0	2	<p>We therefore respectfully request that you develop an alternative (if not the proposed action) for detailed analysis in the DEIS that includes no designation of ATV trails and additional classified roads inside the boundary of UEC's proposed wilderness areas on the Fishlake NF. This alternative would be reasonable under the definitions for detailed analysis of all reasonable alternatives under NEPA.</p>
-----	---	---	-----------------	---	---

194	10	P	ALTER.2310 0	100	<p>The Forest Service Handbook, chapter 20, section 23.2 states that the purpose and intent of alternatives are to "ensure that the, range of alternatives does not foreclose prematurely any option that might protect, restore and enhance the environment." NEPA regulations (40 C.F.R. 1502.14) require that agencies should "(r)igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives ... ". Similarly, case law has established that consideration of alternatives which lead to similar results is not sufficient to meet the intent of NEPA. Citizens for Environmental Quality v. United States, 731 F. Supp. 970, 989 (D.Colo. 1989); State of California v. Block, 690 F.2d 753 (9th Cir. 1982). Under NEPA, an environmental impact statement must contain a discussion of "alternatives to the proposed action." 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(D). As interpreted by binding regulations of the CEQ, an environmental impact statement must "(r)igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives." 40 C.F.R. 1502.14(a). The importance of this mandate cannot be downplayed; under NEPA, a rigorous review of alternatives is "the heart of the environmental impact statement." 40 C.F.R. 1502.14. Specifically pointing to the range of wilderness recommendations found in Forest Plan revisions, the CEQ has said that, "For some proposals there may exist a very large or even an infinite number of possible reasonable alternatives. For example, a proposal to designate wilderness areas within a National Forest could be said to involve an infinite number of alternatives from 0 to 100 percent of the Forest. When there are potentially a very large number of alternatives, only a reasonable number of examples, covering the full spectrum of alternatives, must be analyzed and compared in the EIS.</p>
194	11	P	ALTER.2310 0	100	<p>An appropriate series of alternatives might include dedicating 0, 10, 30, 50, 70, 90 or 100 percent of the Forest to Wilderness." CEQ, Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's NEPA Regulations, 46 Fed. Reg. 18026, 18027 (March 23, 1981) There could potentially be an infinite number of alternatives for this travel plan revision, so we believe this CEQ direction applies to alternative development for this</p>

194	12	P	ALTER.2340 0	100	Developing an alternative that does not include designated ATV trails or new classified roads inside UEC's citizen's wilderness proposal constitutes a reasonable alternative the context of the above-mentioned NEPA regulations and CEQ direction. Accordingly, we respectfully request that the Forest include such an alternative. If you do not feel that this constitutes an alternative that is reasonable under NEPA for inclusion in your analysis, please call our office and explain your concerns. We are confident we would be able to address your concerns.
152	13	RM	ALTER.2310 0	620	Suggestions: c) The planning team should develop management alternatives that allow for proactive OHV management. All alternatives should include specific provisions to mark, map and maintain existing OHV opportunities. All alternatives should include instructions to engage in cooperative management with OHV groups and individuals.
152	14	RM	TRANS.4082 0	1	Suggestions: d) Alternatives should include areas where OHV trails can be constructed and maintained when demand increases.
63	17	I	ALTER.2330 0	51	I am aware of a citizen's Travel Plan that a coalition of conservation groups has been developing for the Fishlake. I am an active supporter of these groups, which include Redrock Forests, Grand Canyon Trust, The Wilderness Society, Sierra Club and Southern Utah Wilderness Association. I urge the Forest Service to openly and honestly welcome the concepts and ideas contained in this Citizen's Travel Plan. Please make this the basis for your final Travel Plan, as it provides resource protection needed along with a balanced approach that also allows fair OHV use of these lands.

Public Concern Number 203

Public Concern Order 17

Public Concern The Forest Service should issue separate summer recreation and winter recreation travel plans: a) because they have different levels and timing of use, b) because they have different types and levels of resource impacts than summer recreation.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

44	1	I	ALTER.2110 0	165	The National OHV Policy has clearly indicated that snowmobile travel is not part of the scope of the overall project. Why is it necessary for Fishlake to go beyond the National Policy? (i.e. there are numerous areas shown on the initial proposals [Alt 2] that are closed to over-the-snow vehicles.)
44	2	I	ALTER.2110 0	2	Fishlake should strongly consider issuing separate summer recreation travel plans and winter recreation travel plans. The issues are different, travel experience is different, impacts are different and accordingly, one size does not fit all. Wasatch-Cache has already started this through their revised Forest Plan by issuing separate ROS categories for summer vs. winter. This would truly add to simplifying the process and make far more readable maps.
44	3	I	PRCSS.1020 0	620	Future travel plan maps for winter motorized recreation should retain, at a minimum, at least the same snowmobiling access as published by the Utah Division of Parks & Recreation on their current Snowmobile Complex Maps.
65	35	I	RECRE.531 20	2	Snowmobiles are pervasive, BUT, not in the same ways as an OHV. Snowmobiles disturb and displace wildlife during the most critical survival time of the year. In addition, if the snow depth is not deep enough the snowmobile will damage vegetation. I have seen this, personally. Snowmobiles do cause soil erosion when they cross bare ground and small streams. I have seen this, too. USDA-FS has stated that snowmobiles are prohibited from certain areas because of wildlife disturbance and displacement. So, snowmobiles are pervasive, just in different ways than an OHV. The impacts caused by snowmobiles are just as different from OHV's as horseback riding is from hiking. The last sentence of the FAQ answer REALLY sums it up and is the real reason for not addressing snowmobiles.

Public Concern Number 204

Public Concern Order 18

Public Concern The Forest Service should consider the economic value of motorized recreation to local economies: a) to provide a larger tax base, b) to promote local employment, c) to meet NEPA disclosure requirements.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

193	3	I	TRANS.4105 0	910	An issue, that is one of the most important issues, was only briefly talked about in the meeting, is the economic impact OHV travel in this area has on Piute County and other counties in the Fishlake National Forest. Piute County is one of the most economically depressed counties in the state of Utah, and needs all the tax revenue it can develop just to keep the county running. To close most of the trails to OHV travel could have a very negative economic impact to the area because people might stop coming to this area if there are not many good trails for people to ride.
-----	---	---	-----------------	-----	---

Public Concern Number 205

Public Concern Order 19

Public Concern The Forest Service should consider the economic costs of motorized recreation: a) from maintaining the route infrastructure, b) from creating or having to mitigate environmental impacts, c) from loss of business from displaced non-motorized users.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
-------------	--------------	----------------	---------------	------------------	----------------

173	19	P	PRCSS.1310 0	910	The Fishlake NF attributes excessive and unrealistic economic and social benefits from ORV use. The Fishlake National Forest 2001 Monitoring Report states: "The economic success of the system continues to grow with use. It is conservatively estimated that riders spend \$110 per day in support of riding. This is for fuel, lodging, food, repairs, and accessories associated with the sport. Using \$110 per day for the 60,160 riders, amounts to over 6 million dollars the motorized system contributed to the local economy." After visiting the Fishlake NF over several days over a large area in July 2004, Red Rock Forests and Great Old Broads for Wilderness conclude that almost all ORV use is associated with campers in RVs and Trailers within the Forest. We noted some use by local ORV riders. Estimating a dollar amount to the value of ORV recreation in the vicinity of the Fishlake NF is a complex process. It would necessarily require more than vehicle counts from automatic counters. ORV riders travel back and forth multiple times to and from trailheads. Were the counts adjusted to account for multiple counts of a single user? The estimate of \$110 per day seems exorbitant considering that the use we saw was associated with campers in the forest and not people visiting the trails from the surrounding communities. How did the Fishlake NF decide how much ORV riders spent per day in local communities? How did the Fishlake NF determine how many of the ORV riders stayed at lodging in local communities or ate in local restaurants? The simple multiplication of \$110 per day times 60,160 riders is too simplistic of a method to calculate economic value. This vastly over estimates the value of ORV use in the area. The Fishlake NF needs to spell out the methods and data used to reach their social, economic, and ecological conclusions.
173	22	P	ALTER.2110 0	900	The Fishlake NF must make a realistic assessment of the economic benefit and the cost of maintaining motorized roads and trails on the Forest.

Public Concern Number 206

Public Concern Order 20

Public Concern The Forest Service should propose additional Forest Plan Standards as part of the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project: a) to comply with NFMA, b) to comply with NEPA.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

173	1	P	ALTER.2110 0	163	One thing about the NOI and possible alternatives which puzzles us is the statement, "The added restrictions on motorized cross-country travel are the only proposed amendments to the forest plan at this time." From our conversations we understand that the Fishlake NF intends to add several hundred miles of classified roads and motorized trails to the current transportation system. This seems counter to the assertion that "restrictions on motorized cross-country travel are the only proposed amendments to the forest plan at this time." We have chosen to make scoping comments relevant to the classification of hundreds of miles of roads and trails.
173	46	P	RECRE.500 00	2	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Background National forests and grasslands contribute \$134 billion to the gross domestic product, with the lion's share associated with outdoor recreation (USFS 1999) By mid-century our nation's population is projected to increase by nearly 50%. There are increasing demands for a variety of high quality year-round recreation opportunities, especially day-use activities including hiking, picnicking, driving, and trail use, as well as access to dispersed areas where people recreate. Additional challenges follow as increased visitation, urban influences, and a healthy-lifestyle trend create the demand for convenient forest access, improvements to facilities, environmental safeguards, and conservation education programs. Emphasis must be placed on holistic planning that addresses all forms of recreation (as well as other landscape-scale disturbances, such as timber cutting, mining, and livestock grazing) simultaneously, and is based on least-impact and/or leave-no-trace doctrines. The Forest must plan for recreation cumulatively, rather than segmenting one type of recreational use or one type of land-disturbing activity from another. Low and mid-elevation hiking and equestrian trails, in short supply free from motorized noise and movement, need to
173	47	P	RECRE.532 00	440	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Suitable Uses Non-motorized recreational activities are suitable where such activities can be demonstrated to provide no potential for further loss or preclude no potential recovery of sensitive, threatened, or

173	48	P	RECRE.533 00	131	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Suitable Uses Mechanized activities are suitable on trails that have been specifically analyzed and designated as open through a public NEPA process.
173	49	P	ALTER.2240 0	630	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation - Recreation Planning a. Threatened, endangered, and sensitive species occupied habitat and potential recovery habitat are mapped in relation to: i. hiking trails ii. mountain bike trails iii. concessionaire facilities and trails iv. boating lakes, reservoirs, and streams v. campgrounds vi. dispersed camping sites vii. popular climbing spots viii. commercial ski facilities and trails ix. target shooting sites. boat launches b. Probable or observed impacts to TES species from recreational sites, facilities, routes, or use levels are mitigated via any of the following: i. Redesign ii. Relocation iii. redirection of use iv. use permitting v. elimination of the site, facility, route, or particular use c. Facilities, areas, routes, or use levels with potential impacts on TES species are prioritized for monitoring and management decisions regarding the need for mitigation. d. All relevant Objectives and Standards specified for motorized recreation trail designation and maintenance apply to trails. e. Site-specific recreational thresholds are identified on an ecological basis. f. Hiking opportunities are available throughout the Forests, in ample supply, in areas free from the audio and visual impacts of motorized recreation, or conflicts stemming from high-speed mechanized recreation. g. Non-motorized access on trails that are closed to motorized users is assured near communities and at low elevations. h. To ensure that resource protection objectives are met: i. All permanent or seasonal trail closures are enforced ii. Social (user-created) trails leading to or from campgrounds, dispersed camping sites, popular viewpoints, and trailheads are prevented and eliminated by design first, natural barriers second, and signs third.

173	50	P	ALTER.2240 0	630	Comment #45 continued: i. Trail grade criteria for soil type and recreation type are developed and applied in trail location, relocation, and permitted type of use. j. Trail connectivity and habitat fragmentation prevention are emphasized in new or replacement trail construction. k. Review for safety of other users all mountain bike trails that do not meet the following criteria: minimum sight distance of +/- 85 feet for trail grades of 5-10% at blind turns; minimum sight distance of +/- 50 feet for trail grades of 10-15% at blind turns; minimum sight distance of +/- 25 feet for trail grades over 15% at blind curves. Mitigate as necessary.
173	51	P	ALTER.2240 0	500	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation 2) Public outreach a. Educational and natural resource information signs and outreach to all recreationists instill a "leave no trace" ethic and enhance visitor experiences. b. Cooperative agreements are formed with communities and user groups to help provide education, trail monitoring and maintenance. i. Agreements are regulated by protocol and imply neither special privileges nor ownership of facilities such as signs. c. Improved availability of information allows visitors to select settings to match the experiences they desire and know what to expect before they arrive.

173	52	P	ALTER.2240 0	510	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions - Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Recreational management a. The trail network is constructed and maintained to levels commensurate with area objectives, desired conditions, sustainable resource conditions, and the type and level of use. b. Forests eliminate overuse and overcrowding in sensitive habitats by: i. monitoring and enforcing permanent or seasonal closures, ii. closing areas where biological resources are at risk, iii. directing users towards more resilient areas, and educating users on the incompatibility of certain recreational activities with sustainable natural conditions, and iv. educating users on the incompatibility of certain recreational activities with sustainable natural conditions. c. All trails are mapped and designated (including season of use) as: i. hiking and equestrian use only; ii. some mechanized allowable uses (e.g. hiking, equestrian, bicycling) and iii. some non-motorized and motorized allowable uses (e.g. hiking, equestrian, bicycling and motorcycles on single track trails) iv. all non-motorized and motorized allowable uses (e.g. hiking, equestrian, bicycling, and two- and four-wheeled off-road vehicle routes). d. An interconnected trail network, access points, and support facilities: i. complement local, regional and national trails and open space, ii. enhance day use opportunities and access for the general public, and iii. link to surrounding communities, creating more opportunities for non-motorized recreation. e. Opportunities are developed through partnerships to obtain funding and projects to reduce the backlog of facility
173	53	P	ALTER.2240 0	510	Comment #47 continued: f. To prevent adverse impacts (e.g. trail degradation, soil erosion and compaction, degradation of water quality, or riparian sedimentation), Forests prioritize: i. trail maintenance and enhancement projects, as well as restoration projects; ii. rerouting and/or seasonal trail closures; iii. trail closure. g. All trails not designated and posted as open to mechanized recreation are closed to such use.
173	54	P	ALTER.2240 0	631	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Equestrian a. Equestrians use certified weed-free forage, free of non-native plant species for all erosion control, restoration, and livestock and pack stock activities in National

173	55	P	ALTER.2240 0	640	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Mountain Bikes a. All trails on which bicycles are allowed are reviewed for conflicts and safety issues with other users. b. Safety standards, including speed limits, for bicyclists reduce conflicts with other users on mechanized trails. c. Use of mechanized recreation vehicles on Forest lands is permitted only to the extent that monitoring and enforcement of restrictions are implemented.
173	56	P	ALTER.2240 0	927	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Outfitters and Guides, Commercial Concessionaires a. Party size of outfitted or guided groups is limited to a quota of people and/or stock that adequately protects natural resources; the quota is re-evaluated biannually, based on observed conditions. b. Annual Operating Plans required by permits for outfitters, guides and commercial concessionaires include the months or timing of activities in the Forest. c. As a condition of the permit, each permittee completes and submits invasive species forms for each month in which their services are provided; the Forest provides simple identification guides for key invasive species. d. Outfitters and guides obtain training in heritage resource protection and the significance and sensitivity of cultural sites. e. Commercial concessionaires, outfitters and guides are knowledgeable about methods of avoiding or reducing impacts to sensitive natural
173	57	P	ALTER.2240 0	500	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Campgrounds a. Capacity of campgrounds and designated campsites to serve visitors is assessed to determine needs for development of alternate sites to protect sensitive resources from dispersed camping. b. Campground noise standards reduce conflicts between Forest visitors, and reduce adverse impacts on noise-sensitive native wildlife.

173	58	P	ALTER.2240 0	680	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions - Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Dispersed Camping a. Where overuse is undermining protection of an area's natural or cultural resources, regulated camping sites are designated and provided in less sensitive areas b. Where camping impacts are spreading, revegetate satellite camping sites and install natural barriers. c. Restrictions necessary to protect TES and candidate species, riparian areas, and watersheds through appropriate backcountry use include. i. camping at least 200 feet from the nearest water source; and ii. fire restrictions in keeping with objectives and standards of vegetative community management and fire management; and iii. year-round or seasonal area closures in vulnerable
173	59	P	ALTER.2240 0	630	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Climbing a. Within 1 year, outreach materials are developed and distributed that: i. require the use of camming devices or other temporary safety devices as opposed to permanent bolts, and colored chalk and slings that match the rock; ii. prohibit chalk use in areas where it becomes a visual impact.
173	60	P	ALTER.2240 0	635	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions - Sustainable Uses by People - Non-Motorized Recreation - Winter/Snow-based Recreation a. Where scientific evidence or observations indicate harm to native aquatic species or habitats from ski-area water diversions, Forests and concessionaires cooperatively implement mitigation measures. b. Primitive cross-country and backcountry skiing opportunities are not compromised by visual or sound intrusions from motorized recreation.
173	61	P	ALTER.2240 0	650	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Fishing, Hunting and Target Shooting a. Forests cooperate with UDWR and communities striving for quality fishing and hunting experiences. b. Cooperative establishment of shooting ranges near major roads reduces conflicts between target shooting and sensitive resources.

173	62	P	ALTER.2240 0	630	<p>Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Monitoring Measures 1) Annually report a. the number, type and quality of recreation sites, areas, permits and activities, including occupancy/use rates; b. a facility condition index and maintenance back log; c. the number of accidents, complaints, citizen reports, citations, and acres and type of impact of each illegal activity. d. Trails, stewardship, and education: i. miles of trail operated to standard, ii. location of user-created trails iii. methods and acres/miles of trail-system impact areas treatment iv. miles of unclassified trails removed or classified trails added to the system, and v. number of accessible day use loop trails created. vi. number of nongovernmental organizations, groups and volunteers involved in stewardship activities; and vii. number and type of educational programs developed and number of students reached. viii. adverse trail impacts ix. mileage and location of user-created trails reported by Forest Service and Forest users. 2) Every fifth year evaluate: a. trends in illegal behaviors; b. trends in annual indicators and visitor satisfaction surveys to determine quality of recreational experiences. 3) Forests encourage user group visitor satisfaction surveys that a. comply with Forest standards for such surveys, and b. are peer</p>
-----	----	---	-----------------	-----	---

173	63	P	ALTER.2250 0	630	<p>Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Standards</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Within 2 years, examine all Forest lands for unauthorized trails: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. illegally constructed for mechanized use; b. unwittingly pioneered by hikers, bikers, or equestrians near campgrounds, dispersed camping areas, view points, or trailheads. 2) When recreational use exceeds ecologically based thresholds, permits or other methods of redirecting recreation are instituted. 3) Close all non-system trails found or reported. To the maximum extent practicable, restore habitat to natural condition. 4) In wilderness, no new fixed anchors may be installed unless they are necessary to prevent a risk to life or are a replacement for existing, unsafe fixed anchors. 5) Motorized drills in wilderness are prohibited. 6) Vegetation clearing for the convenience of climbers is prohibited. 7) During the occupancy season of listed species, areas are seasonally closed to recreation activities where these activities have the potential to conflict with nesting or reproductive behaviors. 8) Snowmobiling and back country skiing are separated as necessary to ensure no visual or sound intrusion from snowmobiles more than 1/4 mile beyond trailhead. 9) No expansions and no new commercial ski areas are permitted. 10) New water withdrawals and increases in water withdrawals for commercial ski areas are prohibited. 11) Coordinate fish stocking activities with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) to ensure that no exotic fish are introduced to areas that could support habitat for listed or sensitive aquatic species (native fish, amphibians, etc.).
-----	----	---	-----------------	-----	--

173	64	P	RECRE.500 00	2	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions - Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Motorized Transportation/Recreation Background Forest access is sufficient to meet all Desired Conditions and Objectives of the Forest Resource Management Plan. The Forest Travel Plan emphasizes protection of the key native and cultural resources (USFS 1999) that provide an overall measure of the Forest's health and integrity. Ample recreation opportunities are provided. The Forests plan and manage for all recreational activities in a holistic manner that is based on least-impact or leave-no-trace/tread lightly principles. The rustic character and wildlands atmosphere that define the Forest are protected and restored, made reasonably accessible to the public, and kept healthy for generations to come. A commitment to certainty of protection to natural resources allows for timely and appropriate responses to unforeseen environmental impacts or misuse, and unanticipated recreation vehicle developments or trends. Full NEPA analysis is applied to every project proposed to accommodate the use of motor vehicles (Categorical Exclusions are not allowed). Planning, management and enforcement of off-road vehicles and use are consistent with Executive Orders 11644 and 11989. The Forest prohibits motorized vehicle use in legislatively or administratively proposed Wilderness areas and other wilderness quality lands including designated and de facto roadless areas.
173	65	P	RECRE.531 00	440	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions - Sustainable Uses by People - Non-Motorized Recreation Suitable Uses Motor vehicle use is permitted within occupied sensitive, threatened, or endangered species habitat only if such activities can be demonstrated to provide no potential for further loss and do not hinder the recovery of the species due to direct or indirect impacts.

173	66	P	RECRE.531 00	160	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Suitable Uses Motor vehicle use occurs only on FS system roads and routes: a. where the agency has demonstrated-in a public process-that use of the road or route by motor vehicles is amenable to enforcement of all rules, compatible with long-term ecological health and native species of the area, and not redundant for reasonable access to an area; b. where such roads and routes have been inventoried, described, and displayed on the Forest's Transportation Atlas and identified as part of the "minimum road system needed for safe and efficient travel and for administration, utilization and protection of National Forest system lands." 36 C.F.R. ?? 212.2; 212.5(b). This minimum road system must "incorporate a science-based roads analysis at the appropriate scale." 36 C.F.R. ? 212.5(b).c. that are designated open on the Forest Travel Map and posted open on the ground; and d. that were designed, engineered and analyzed for motorized travel in accordance with NEPA. Cross country travel is prohibited.
173	67	P	TRANS.4070 0	2	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Suitable Uses Designation of off-road vehicle routes is based on specific criteria, including, but not limited to: a. avoidance of threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant and wildlife species habitat; b. minimization of soil erosion; c. maintenance and protection of wildlife movement corridors; d. protection of wildlife migration routes, denning, calving and fawning grounds; e. avoidance of wildlife harassment or significant disruption of wildlife habitat; f. prevention of invasive species introduction, establishment, and spread; g. minimization of fragmentation of ecosystems; h. protection of meadows, wetlands, riparian areas, and streams; i. avoidance of cultural and historic resources, and; j. minimization of conflicts (including noise and pollution) between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed uses on the Forest or neighboring public lands; and k. protection of roadless areas.

173	68	P	TRANS.4000 0	131	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Suitable Uses No new motorized recreation vehicle routes are designated, upgraded, or constructed until a Transportation Plan has been developed based on system roads, and any other currently existing routes that have been designated as appropriate, subject to Forest-wide environmental impact analysis. This analysis must include an evaluation of the impacts of classified, temporary and unclassified roads/routes.
173	69	P	ALTER.2240 0	510	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions. Sustainable Uses by People Non-Motorized Recreation Forest Travel Plan a. The Forest Travel Plan is based upon the minimum transportation system sufficient to meet reasonable human access and diverse recreation opportunities. b. The Forest Travel Plan is based on a map of classified roads and motorized recreation vehicle routes that have previously gone through NEPA analysis prior to revised Forest Planning (i.e., "Baseline Transportation Network"). c. All additional roads and routes designated during the Travel Planning process as open are geographically distributed in a manner that minimizes habitat fragmentation, hydrological and riparian degradation, and human contact with sensitive resources. d. The Forest allows access to the most people with the fewest roads and routes and allocates limited resources in order to: i. retain a higher percentage of high maintenance level roads (roads that can be driven by passenger vehicles); ii. reduce the hard-to-reach, high-clearance routes that reach deep into backcountry areas and are not essential to moving people or goods through the Forest; iii. increase the ability of the Forest to fully maintain all of its designated roads and routes for ecological protection. e. The Forest identifies roads and routes for closure, including those that are: i. unneeded for reasonable access; ii. redundant; iii. unsafe; iv. contributing to significant cumulative ecological harm to aquatic or terrestrial wildlife and habitats. prioritized for ecological benefit (e.g., roads/routes "encroaching" on streams and other water bodies or riparian influence); or v. inadequately decommissioned or reclaimed as previously required.

173 70 P ALTER.2240 510
0

Comment #63 continued: f. The Forest prioritizes closed roads and routes for reclamation for the following reasons: i. roads or routes are causing significant environmental harm (e.g. disrupting hydrologic flow, fragmenting habitat, increasing stream sedimentation);ii. closure efforts are ineffective; and iii. roads and routes to be reclaimed will reduce long-term maintenance costs for the entire transportation system on the Forest. g. Once routes are identified for closure or reclamation, the Forest develops a detailed closure/reclamation strategy, including: i. enforceable timelines, including a schedule for reclamation where that is needed; ii. feasible budget and staff allocations; iii. effective means to prohibit continued motor vehicle use. h. The Travel Plan allows no net gain of road or motorized route miles during its lifetime. i. Ecologically sustainable unclassified roads and routes are converted to meet the need for mechanized (non-motorized) recreation trails when feasible as a substitute for new construction of non-motorized routes. j. Roads and routes do not dead-end at sensitive areas, tempting users to travel across vulnerable lands, or where they can connect to another route or road.

173	71	P	ALTER.2240 0	431	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions - Sustainable Uses by People - Non-Motorized Recreation Habitat Fragmentation Analysis/Route Designation a. Several alternative transportation networks based on the evaluation of the Baseline Transportation Network are considered and analyzed. b. All alternative networks are analyzed in light of their direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on key biological, physical, recreational, and cultural resources. c. In choosing the preferred alternative, natural resources, not roads, are given certainty of protection throughout the life of the Travel Plan. The Forest maintains the authority to close roads and routes because of unacceptable safety or environmental impacts. d. The Travel Plan ensures that designated uses on designated roads and routes are compatible with designated uses on adjacent public land units; e. No road construction occurs in any roadless areas greater than 1,000 acres or in biologically significant roadless areas smaller than 1,000 acres. f. Additions to the Motorized Road/Route Network i. All additions to the motorized road/route network will be authorized following a comprehensive NEPA analysis. ii. Categorical exclusions will not be utilized to add motorized roads/routes to the Forest's travel network. iii. Any proposed addition to the motorized road/route network must be analyzed in relation to the Forest Travel atlas and may be authorized only after consideration of the existing impacts of classified, temporary, and unclassified roads/routes. iv. Prior to adding additional motorized roads/routes, the Forest must consider all relevant information attained
173	72	P	ALTER.2240 0	935	Three Forests Coalition Sustainable Multiple Use Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions - Sustainable Uses by People - Non-Motorized Recreation Transportation Plan Implementation a. Plan implementation is consistent with all elements of the Forest LRMP, includes enforceable timelines, and devotes a portion of staff time and annual budgets for route designation, maintenance, road and route closure, road and route reclamation, and enforcement. b. Administrative roads and routes and rights of way for lessees and private inholdings are i. used only for the stated administrative purpose: ii. and are closed when their administrative purpose is fulfilled.

173 73 P ALTER.2240 620
0

Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions - Sustainable Uses by People - Non-Motorized Recreation - Motorized Recreation a. Motorized recreation is allowable only as it is consistent and compatible with protecting natural resources, protecting human and wildlife safety, and preventing user-conflicts with non-motorized users. b. The Travel map indicates: i. Trailheads and access requirements for vehicles that are not street legal; ii. allowable motorized and non-motorized uses; iii. sensitive resources and ecological constraints; iv. road/route mileage and density; v. road/route condition and maintenance needs. c. The Forest Travel Map, and signs posted in the field clearly indicate roads and routes that are open to motorized use, the types of vehicles and uses that are allowed, and, where applicable, the season(s) of allowable use. d. Snowmobiles are allowed on designated routes. e. All other roads, routes, and areas are closed to motor vehicles. f. Personal watercraft are prohibited. g. Conflicts between off-road vehicle users and other recreationists or private landowners, and related resource issues are addressed publicly and resolved in a timely manner. Resolutions are consistent with the off-road vehicle Executive Orders 11644 and 11989, area Desired Conditions, and management

173 74 P ALTER.2240 620
0

Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions - Sustainable Uses by People - Non-Motorized Recreation - Motor Vehicle Monitoring, Education, and Enforcement a. Use of motorized recreation vehicles on Forest lands is permitted only to the extent that monitoring of the impacts and enforcement of restrictions on that use are funded and implemented. b. In cooperation with the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation, the Forest establishes a registration system covering all motorized recreation vehicles not licensed for highway use. c. Travel Maps that clearly articulate exactly where motorized recreational use is allowed are available to all Forest visitors and provided to all motorized recreation vehicle registrants. d. Educational materials used by the Forest, or its cooperators: i. acknowledge that the presence of roads, machines, and accompanying noise and dust destroy the quiet and solitude sought by many people; ii. interpret for recreation machine operators the value of sensitive natural resources, problems that certain types of behavior cause, and how to minimize impacts. e. Forest protocols are established for monitoring by citizens and independent scientists, of motor vehicle use, conditions of roads/routes, and Forest response to such monitoring. f. Cooperative agreements with communities and user groups providing motor vehicle monitoring, education, route maintenance and/or repair of resource damage from illegal use, are strictly regulated by protocol and convey neither special privileges nor ownership of facilities such as signs. g. Cooperative agreements with the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation provide supplemental resources for Forest Service monitoring, education, and enforcement of motor vehicle use and regulations.

173	75	P	ALTER.2240 0	620	<p>Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions - Sustainable Uses by People - Non-Motorized Recreation Monitoring Measures - Annual reporting: a. Status of maintenance backlog and projects completed; b. Surveys of road and route conditions and ecological impacts on at least 10 percent of designated routes; each route is surveyed at least once every 10 years; c. Intensity of use and kinds of use in relation to permitted uses on a statistically significant sample of designated roads and routes d. Numbers and mileage of renegade routes created by off-road vehicle users, and FS action taken to close such routes. Reporting every three years: a. Effectiveness of road/route closures and restrictions of use on administrative routes. b. Occurrence of new user-created routes and Forest response to such occurrences c. Costs of road/route maintenance, closure, and rehabilitation. d. Mileage of roads reclaimed/decommissioned, including information about the treatments used and costs of treatment.</p>
-----	----	---	-----------------	-----	--

173	76	P	ALTER.2250 0	510	<p>Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions - Sustainable Uses by People - Non-Motorized Recreation Motorized Recreation Management Standards</p> <p>1) Habitat Fragmentation Analysis/Route Designation a. Roads and routes known by the Forest staff to be causing excessive resource damage shall be closed. b. All non-Baseline Network roads/routes encroaching within the standard widths identified by the 1995 Inland Native Fish Strategy (USDA 1995) for Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas shall be prioritized for realignment or closure/removal, with 10 percent closed/realigned each year.2) Motorized Recreation a. recreation shall be allowed only on system roads and routes engineered, analyzed and designated for such use.3) Motor Vehicle Monitoring, Education, and Enforcement a. Off-road vehicles will be registered with the Forest (or Region) and display a clearly identifiable, photographable registration number while operating in the Forest. b. Issuance of free vehicle registration tags shall be contingent upon owner's signed statement that all rules are understood and will be obeyed. c. Any vehicle found in the forest without this tag, observed off-trail, or willfully causing resource damage shall be cited and consequences shall be adequate to discourage further infractions. d. Citizen monitoring and evidence of environmental damage and travel plan violations will be recorded and responded to by the Forest in accordance with Desired Conditions and travel management regulations. e. Areas where irresponsible behavior or willful disobedience is not being successfully curtailed will be closed to motorized recreation use.</p>	Motor
173	77	P	ALTER.2250 0	620	<p>Forest Plan: Transportation and Recreation Plans pertinent to travel plan revisions - Sustainable Uses by People - Non-Motorized Recreation Motorized Recreation Management Standards - Monitoring Measures: Annual reporting a. Number of off-road vehicles detected on Forest without registration. b. Forest response to citizen enforcement reports and user conflict reports. c. Costs of staff enforcement and mitigation of impacts.</p>	

Public Concern Number 301

Public Concern Order 21

Public Concern *The Forest Service should protect the physical and biological resources on the Fishlake National Forest: a) for future generations, b) to meet the agency mission and legal mandates, c) for homeland security.*

Issue Number

Ltr#	Cmnt#	OrgType	Action	Rationale	Comment
98	1	I	RECRE.531 00	300	We are all aware that the need for a revised plan is well established; even your Chief, Dale Bosworth, has commented on the need to actively manage rampant OHV use in the Forests, citing the risks to the health of the forest posed by these machines. I would also like to cite the following quote from acting District Ranger Donna Owen of the Dixie NF: "The environment -- particularly around 10,000 feet elevation -- is fragile, and when we go and put in a road we're going to do it so that it is environmentally appropriate so that it doesn't cause degradation to the meadows, wetlands and wildlife," Owen said. "We make sure we're going to use the wilderness areas with respect and don't allow anyone to go pioneer a road or go cross country just because they have a destination in mind ... it wrecks havoc, especially at that elevation." [1] Do you find this to any less accurate for the Fishlake?
19	1	I	PRCSS.1010 0	23	OHVs and their riders are a major threat to the natural landscapes of the West. The definition of "Off Highway" and "fun" equals a growing cancer of destruction of natural areas by the ever increasing "making of a new path" through the natural areas that have not been driven through in the past. This is entirely unacceptable, and against the public agency that is charged with the management of the public lands for ALL of the American people.
117	2	I	NRMGT.300 00	450	ATV use has increased the disturbance to wildlife. With long seasons, scouting, and the increasing popularity of shed hunting roadless areas seem to be the only chance for many species to get even a temporary reprieve.
17	3	I	SOCEC.700 00	910	It is time that our forest areas are saved for all Americans and not turned into profit making opportunities for locals.
19	3	I	PRCSS.1010 0	23	I believe it is the Forest Services moral and ethical stand against any more "trails" of destruction being created by these

50	3	I	NRMGT.300 00	2	I believe the Forest Service and the BLM have been slow to respond to the threat of uncontrolled ORVs. You must act to protect these areas now. The next generation of ORVs will be on us before we know it, and without a travel plan that looks down the road ten or twenty years, it may well be too late to keep anything in its current natural state. As someone who has been to this area several times, driven it, walked it, fished it, slept in it, I ask you to act to protect it. Now.
63	10	I	NRMGT.300 00	300	I strongly support the development of a strong, balanced, and a fairly structured Travel Plan. The final Plan should be that which best safeguards the Fishlake's wilderness and natural resources, quality recreational opportunities, diverse wildlife habitat, as well as a healthy local economy. I urge you to modify your current Travel Plan proposal, and to incorporate the following important changes. 1)The Fishlake NF must safeguard the habitat of any threatened wildlife by maintaining ALL the remaining roadless lands on the Forest for non-motorized use only. The Fishlake is important to the survival of at risk species. The roadless lands support wildlife must not be fragmented by additional development of any kind, and most especially of trails or roads that will be heavily frequented by OHV users. 2) The Fishlake must restore degraded lands where excessive routes are effecting wildlife and water quality.
108	12	I	TRANS.4000 0	1	The best way to meet national security interests, provide proper stewardship to our public lands, and protect resources of all types is to now begin the total and complete phase-out of ORV use on public
98	13	I	TRANS.4020 0	2	As a taxpayer and forest user, I must insist that no new routes be added into the Fishlake National Forest's Travel Plan, and that all regulations and laws are closely followed when an unclassified or closed road/route is proposed for change of status. Alternative 2 follows neither the letter nor the intent of the many regulations on the books to protect our National Forest for long-term health and the enjoyment of current and future generations of Americans.
63	18	I	PRCSS.1010 0	300	Protection of the lands and the Forest's resources remain the primary goal and responsibility for the Forest Service. The Forest Service is the steward of these lands tasked with assuring future generations will have access to a Fishlake NF undiminished and untrammelled.

Public Concern Number 302

Public Concern Order 22

Public Concern

The Forest Service should increase protections for roadless areas and potential wilderness: a) to address future growth in motorized use, b) to protect soils, c) to protect watersheds, d) to protect wildlife, d) to protect rare plants, e) to protect sensitive, threatened, and endangered species, f) to protect non-motorized recreational opportunities.

Issue Number

Ltr#	Cmnt#	OrgType	Action	Rationale	Comment
63	1	I	RECRE.531 00	300	Please consider these comments, and please determine that the maximum acreage of roadless and wilderness quality and wildlife sensitive lands will be made off-limits to Off-Highway Vehicles(OHV), and any other motorized recreation.
20	1	I	TRANS.4000 0	300	We have enough places to drive cars. We need more forests without them. Don't destroy the serenity and survival of our forests, please.
66	2	I	TRANS.4000 0	690	We hope that the Forest Service will be pro-active and create a plan for future increased use, by protecting the roadless, undeveloped areas for wildlife habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities.
59	5	I	RECRE.531 00	690	The Forest Service proposal also fails to plan for the future and fails to consider what the next 15-20 years of ORV technology and population growth will bring to these forest lands. The use level is certainly not going to decrease or stay at its current level; it is sure to increase. The Forest Service must be proactive and plan for this increased use by protecting the roadless, undeveloped areas for wildlife habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities.
194	5	P	NRMGT.300 00	100	- "Given the importance of roadless lands as a resource and the ease with which they may be irretrievably damaged, and the amount of forest land already crossed by roads that facilitate active management of vast acreages, a near total ban on further road construction in the remaining and precious roadless areas within our national forests is not the drastic measure that plaintiffs make it out to be." Id.- "As the case law and the statute itself reflect, the policy of NEPA is first and foremost to protect the natural environment." Id. at 1123.- "Many sensitive wildlife species . . . made their homes in wild and roadless areas of forest, and can know no other life. . . [M]any wildlife species that are hard-pressed for survival have final refuge in roadless areas." Id. at 1125 note 30.

-50	5	I	TRANS.4000 0	690	The Forest Service proposal also fails to plan for the future, and fails to consider what the next 15-20 years of ORV technology and population growth will bring to these forest lands. The use level is certainly not going to decrease or stay at its current level; it is sure to increase. The Forest Service must be pro-active and plan for this increased use, by protecting the roadless, undeveloped areas for wildlife habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities.
55	5	I	RECRE.531 00	690	I also believe the Forest Service proposal should plan for the future, and consider what the next 15-20 years of ORV technology and population growth will bring to these forest lands. The use level is certainly not going to decrease or stay at its current level; it is sure to increase. The Forest Service must be pro-active and plan for this increased use, by protecting the roadless, undeveloped areas for wildlife habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities.
67	7	I	ATTMT.9999 9	710	ATT1:[I used Blue to encircle the basic area I am proposing as wilderness. The topology of this area provides for ease of management of this designation and I feel this area provides for many qualities sought in a wilderness experience.]
63	12	I	RECRE.531 00	690	The Forest Service proposal must consider and plan for the future. The current proposal fails to consider what the next 15-20 years of OHV technology and continued population growth will bring to the Fishlake. The usage level is certainly not going to decrease or remain at the current level; it is sure to increase. The Forest Service must be proactive and plan for this increased use. It should do this by protecting the roadless, undeveloped areas for wildlife habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities. Reservation of these lands to non-motorized uses will stop the degradation of additional lands as would happen under continued use with increasing user populations.

Public Concern Number 303

Public Concern Order 23

Public Concern The Forest Service should monitor OHV impacts on natural resources and other recreational uses: a) to allow adaptive management, b) to comply with agency rules and regulations, c) to protect natural resources.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

104	2	I	NRMGT.301 00	301	I also believe the Forest Service should continue to monitor the impact the OHV's are having on the ecology of forest lands.
98	4	I	NRMGT.301 00	300	I question the Fishlake NF's ability to properly monitor the actions of all forest users, particularly those who have a "history" of damaging practices; irresponsible off-road vehicle operators. These activities are not monitored now.
173	8	P	NRMGT.302 00	620	ORV problems and the Fishlake National Forest - Does the Fishlake National Forest (Fishlake NF) have solid information/research indicating the number of people engaging in illegal use/off-road vehicles? The Fishlake National Forest 2001 Monitoring Report states: "There is also some motorized recreation that occurs illegally. "There are three problem areas with OHV management on the Forest that continue to need some attention. The first is what we call the "baby sitting syndrome" occurring next to larger communities like Richfield, Salina, etc. Local teenage riders venture onto the forest near the community for their afternoon & evening riding experience. They are thrill seeking for jumps, climbs & speed. As such they don't want to use the developed trail system. Users are developing their own trails for this riding experience. "The second occurs in the spring of the year & is associated with antler-shed hunters. These riders are using ATVs on spring ranges to find elk antler sheds. These sheds have a value that sometimes reaches \$20 per pound. A good-sized shed can be 50 to 70 pounds, so value could be in excess of \$1,000. These riders pose an impact to the animals & are riding cross-country while the ground is wet & most susceptible to resource damage. This activity is resulting in numerous user-developed routes in unacceptable locations. "The third problem area is associated with the fall elk & deer hunts. Hunters are using ATVs for access to hunting areas & game retrieval. These users are taking their machines into closed areas, creating new, unwanted trails. "Has the Fishlake NF made an effort to monitor, survey & document on the ground improper or illegal ORV use? The report gave no supporting evidence to the conclusion that it is only a small percentage of users riding illegally. Dan Shroeder from the Ogden Group of the Sierra Club looked at portions of the Paiute ATV Trail over a weekend. He randomly visited a few areas.

173	10	P	NRMGT.301 00	55	Has the Fishlake NF attempted to look at the pioneering of new routes branching from the Paiute ATV Trail? On subsequent visits by staff and volunteers from Red Rock Forests and the Great Old Broads for Wilderness in July, 2004, we found counters to document the number of users on roads and trails. But we found no evidence of any effort to document pioneered trails on the Forest. The Fishlake NF used volunteers to monitor the trail system. Did those volunteers report any violations or problems with ORVs traveling over inappropriate terrain? Did they report off trail travel and evidence of new user created trails? Were the volunteers asked to document such problems? While we do not recommend that volunteers be asked to perform policing duties we do think that official volunteers should be trained on the full range of problems which need to be observed and reported. Since you have ready access to volunteers through the Trail Ranger program as noted in Fishlake National Forest 2001 Monitoring Report you should train the Trail Rangers to monitor and report pioneered routes off trail, incidents or evidence of ORV users traveling off trail. According to the Fishlake National Forest 2001 Monitoring Report" The Forest was able to continue the Trail Ranger program using a National Recreation Trail grant, which is federal money administered by the State of Utah. We had four trail rangers doing light maintenance and visiting with users. Their mission is to promote safe and responsible use along these trail systems. This has been a successful program and one we hope to continue as long as funds are
-----	----	---	-----------------	----	---

Public Concern Number 304

Public Concern Order 24

Public Concern The Forest Service should enforce existing travel rules before proposing new restrictions: a) to maintain existing motorized recreation opportunities.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
115	2	I	NRMGT.302 00	620	A good start would be to enforce existing travel plan - thinks that new rules are still complex and won't be any better without enforcement. Would like to see more focus on younger crowd that often are more of a problem than the older crowd.

160	6	I	TRANS.4105 0	840	Mr. Flanigan has proposed more miles of trail closures than any other region, while we already have less ATV access. We feel that this is not warranted, and he is not interested in maintaining the trails or enforcing the laws. We feel that this is part of his job and he is not completing this responsibility. Forest service employees have voiced the opinion that ATV's should be banned from the mountain all together.
65	11	I	NRMGT.302 00	811	Instead of managing the un-managed use of OHV's, the USDA-FS's answer is to restrict the use of OHV's. The USDA-FS does not have the adaptability, flexibility nor the desire to address and manage the few irresponsible ATV operators that are creating most of the impact problems to the environment. Thus, they have decided to force ALL ATV operators to be penalized because of the few. This is called "mass punishment", a form of discrimination. In addition, by banning all ATV's from cross country travel but allowing other modes of travel, the USDA-FS is discriminating against the disabled and the elderly who wish to utilize the national forest on an ATV. The ATV, a fairly new mode of travel, is the only means by which many disabled and elderly persons can get out and see the national forest. Furthermore, the ATV allows the disabled and the elderly to hunt, camp and visit areas that was once only accessible by persons who are not physically impaired. For the USDA-FS this is the easy way out of a difficult problem.

Public Concern Number 305

Public Concern Order 25

Public Concern The Forest Service should enforce existing travel rules and/or implement new restrictions: a) to protect natural resources, b) to avoid reduction of motorized recreational opportunities.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
171	1	I	NRMGT.302 00	300	I have attached my general thoughts on this project for your consideration. I must admit to being more than a little frustrated by what I consider the negative impact of OHV abuse, abuse that I see as pervasive throughout the Fishlake. As I have mention before and you are certainly aware, this problem will not go away, nor will the damage cease until controls and/or enforcement exceed the problem. In the days ahead I certainly look for a higher level priority, one that equals responsibility.

64	1	I	NRMGT.302 00	2	I am a frequent visitor to Fishlake NF and would like to take a moment to comment on the use of OHV's in the NF. Let me preface my comments with the fact that we too have an OHV that we bring into the forest. Every year I am horrified by the number of "new trails" that have been created by OHV users. It seems as though many people feel like they have the right to ride their OHV's wherever they please. This makes me uncomfortable as an OHV user (because we are perceived as bad) and it also makes me mad as a camper to have to deal with the destruction of such a beautiful place. I think strict regulations that spell out clearly where an OHV can and cannot be are mandatory. There should also be a way that people can report illegal travel on an OHV (like the poaching hot line for hunters) We can't protect our forests without strict and spelled out clearly rules because there are just too many people who don't care and they ruin it for the rest of us.
16	1	I	NRMGT.302 00	300	This is a brief note to express my concerns about the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project. I have hiked extensively throughout the Fishlake National Forest and found it both beautiful and worth preserving for future generations. The primary distraction to this beauty I found to be extensive off-highway vehicle (OHV) use. I have seen numerous instances of OHVs used in OHV restricted areas, OHVs with illegally modified exhaust systems and complete disregard on the part of OHV users for the responsibility to preserve wild areas. When I complained to on-sight forest managers, they essentially threw up their hands and said there was nothing they could do.
-60	1	I	NRMGT.302 00	1	Please limit OHV access and enforce OHV regulations in the Fishlake National Forest. OHVs are ruining our public lands!
1	1	I	NRMGT.302 00	1	I think it is past due! Controlling the illegal use of off road vehicles on the Fishlake Forest.
14	1	I	NRMGT.302 00	300	I have been traveling to Fishlake to recreate and hunt for nearly 25 years I have seen jeep roads that I have used for those 25 years turn into ATV trails and some even closed to all travel. I believe that we need to police ourselves and our kids to limit damage to our surroundings as if we don't it all may be locked up.

67	2	I	NRMGT.320 00	305	During a conversation with Max Reid, he mentioned the counters along various trails and some of the numbers of total users as well as photos in some cases to allow comparison of OHV to regular vehicle counts. These numbers document the fact that OHV users are a very significant portion of the overall use of these public lands and it is appropriate to consider when building a balanced approach in management. These numbers also indicate that without proper management and enforcement their impact to the overall condition could be undesirable.
178	2	I	NRMGT.302 00	2	Last Friday night I camped at Big John's Flat. While there, I witnessed OHVs traveling through the trees and across the meadows where closed signs were clearly placed. I informed those responsible that they were not allowed to ride where off the designated OHV pathways. I was received most unenthusiastically by most. I realize this camping area is near the Paiute Trail and as such if I am going to camp there, I had better count on seeing OHVs. However, I was very disturbed by the total disregard for the restrictions currently in place. As OHV use continues to increase, I fear the problems will only become worse. I am left wondering what is to be done in regards to enforcement? It is obvious that trail signs are not even looked at, much less heeded. Without additional enforcement personnel, it doesn't really matter what the new OHV plan says, the bigger question is, will anyone pay attention to it? I propose increasing the registration fees for OHVs to fund enforcement activities. I am sure this won't be met with much enthusiasm from the OHV crowd but if they are not willing to police themselves, what other choice is there?
91	2	I	NRMGT.302 00	620	The management of the lands has been outstanding in OHV management. This has prevented the unorganized use of these trails and the abuse by that small percentage of OHV riders that are thoughtless and selfish.
165	3	I	NRMGT.302 00	1	I would like to see OHV's banned from all but the most regulated trails. Let's keep them in one area so the off road cops can keep their eyes on them, if they can see them through the dust.
107	3	I	NRMGT.302 00	2	Because we are property owners (near Fish Lake) and live there in the summer, we have always chosen to treat the forest with respect; it is our back yard. Therefore, we have the ability to watch and talk with other people using 4 wheelers and we do remind them of proper conduct when necessary.

171	3	I	NRMGT.302 00	2	As a microcosm of the overall problem on the Fishlake NF, I found that this trail represented a combination of: a. Inadequate marking. b. Inadequate or non-existent maintenance. c. Inadequate control and/or enforcement. d. Poor route selection. As a consequence ATV operators had traversed wherever they chose with little apparent regard for staying on the trail. Conversely, delicate trail surface materials had been eroded to the point that sandstone and other rock outcroppings were becoming the rule, with ATV operators seeking bypasses for easier travel.
43	4	I	NRMGT.302 00	820	Enforcement is - in deed - major. Without it the public will ignore everything you try to
47	4	I	NRMGT.302 00	170	You should discuss measures you will use to obtain compliance by OHV users. A few weeks ago in Utah we saw many places where that policy was posted on BLM lands, but ATV tracks showed that it was being violated.

173	5	P	NRMGT.302 00	2	<p>The ORV problem in general: Illegal ORV use is pervasive. We often hear that it is only a few people who are causing the problems. Yet when the violators are community leaders and government employees this indicates a much more widespread and destructive problem. When San Juan County, Utah, people causing the problems include Forest Service employees and the leaders of local ORV clubs this indicates that the problem is far more prevalent than "just a few people." In No Place Distant (2002, p. 103), David Havlick notes, "Even an ATV-industry poll determined that more than half of the respondents had used their machines to trespass illegally." Havlick cites the online source http:// atvsource.com (21 January 2000). When asked, "Have your ever trespassed illegally on your ATV?" o 55.6 percent responded "yes," o 33.9 percent responded "no," o and 10.5 percent responded "don't know." Similarly, a random poll of ORV, off road motorcycle, and recreational 4x4 owners in Utah revealed that respondents had primarily traveled off established trails on their last riding trip and preferred riding off established trails. (Andrea L. Fisher, et al. Off Highway Vehicle Uses and Owner Preferences in Utah, 2002, Prepared for Utah Dept. of Natural Resources, p. 20). Experience locally indicates that this is true in southeastern Utah. In San Juan County there is a history of ignoring laws, regulations or travel plans regulating ORV use. o Red Rock Forests and the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance documented the president of the Southeastern Utah Land Users creating an illegal trail on the Manti-La Sal National Forest. o In a separate incident, a Manti-La Sal NF employee was observed leading a group of dirt bike riders through an area closed to ORV use. This was reported to the BLM at the time of the occurrence. The group included the children of the Forest Service employee.</p>
100	5	I	NRMGT.302 00	620	<p>The Fishlake already has a nationally renowned OHV Trail System; it needs no additional mileage, only better law enforcement and monitoring.</p>

173	6	P	NRMGT.302 00	2	<p>o A district ranger in another forest in southern Utah was caught riding a dirt bike in Capitol Reef National Park. o San Juan County officials led a "Jeep" ride into Arch Canyon during the 2004 Jeep Jamboree when the BLM refused to permit use of Arch Canyon for the Jamboree. o Kane County officials removed signs from closed trails in the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument. o San Juan County officials twice drove vehicles into Salt Creek in Canyonlands National Park after the National Park Service had closed the canyon to motorized vehicles. If the officials had a legal claim they should have made it in court and not through destructive, illegal behavior. It is difficult to believe that illegal use is a minor problem when such community leaders as those above engage in illegal off-road vehicle activities.</p>
173	7	P	NRMGT.302 00	2	<p>News articles frequently highlight the problems with ORV management. For example, Theo Stein, writing for The Denver Post, reported the following comment from Jack Troyer, the Intermountain Regional Forester: "We're seeing impacts now that we just can't live with. We want to improve our management by achieving a better balance and helping users of the national forests have a better recreation experience and reducing the impacts on land." He also noted the comments of Forest Protection Officer Frank Landis. Stein's article continues, "On Wednesday, Frank Landis, a forest protection officer in the Pike Ranger District, showed two visitors where trucks had churned deep ruts through a lush stream and carved new routes up a steep, sandy bluff to get at illegal trails that Landis' staff had recently blocked." "That is just a complete lack of respect for public lands," said a frustrated Landis. "I mean, what do we have to do, fence the whole road?" "Lack of enforcement is another problem. Under current funding, the Pike District has five forest protection officers like Landis and only one law enforcement officer. Last year, the district issued 600 citations, most for illegal vehicle use." "That's probably a half of one percent of the total infractions," Landis said. "We need to do a better job." (Theo Stein, Off-roading limits weighed for forests, The Denver Post, July 8, 2004) (emphasis</p>
197	8	C	NRMGT.302 00	1	<p>Management and enforcement of this plan, upon its completion, is of great interest to the Commission and county service providers such as the Sheriff and EMS director. Wayne County is very interested in learning more about ultimate management and enforcement, both, as this process continues.</p>

161	8	P	NRMGT.302 00	515	Attachment photo 2: Located near the municipality of Richfield, this ineffective closure highlights current ORV management problems. Riders who violate closures like this one show blatant disregard for authority and a lack of land ethics. Under the current Fishlake travel plan proposal, riders like those who violate closures to ride cross-country will have ample opportunity for future violations due to the very high density of open routes proposed by the Fishlake NF.
-16	9	I	NRMGT.302 00	620	Public education and consistent enforcement are crucial to effective implementation. The Forest Service should provide detailed maps of the final, approved route designations so that users know exactly where certain motorized or non-motorized uses are allowed.
171	11	I	NRMGT.302 00	340	3. Proposed Solution. The following solutions are proposed: d. Define, announce and aggressively enforce rules of conduct for use of trail system. e. As a priority, implement measures to gain and maintain control as if it were important to the health of the several watersheds
63	13	I	NRMGT.302 00	2	The Forest must have a strong travel monitoring system and effective enforcement programs. The proposed Travel Plan will fail if the Forest does not develop and fully implement a strong monitoring and enforcement system to assure that the rules and restrictions of the Travel Plan are followed. At a basic level, a "closed if not posted open" policy is critical. Adequate signage to this effect must be put in place. Most important, an adequate and visible number of rangers must be on patrol year-round to provide the presence necessary to ensure motorized users are not tempted to venture from designated routes.
161	14	P	NRMGT.302 00	300	Attachment photo 8: This route, already officially closed, represents the difficulty of managing the current trail system. The berms at the top of the route, shown in photos 1 and 2, have been cut around by ORVs. No signage is in place, and illegal use continues. The bottom of the route adjacent to Round Lake, shown in photo 3, is not bermed, blocked, or signed in any way. Directly adjacent to and above Round Lake, the route has the potential to severely damage the hydrological integrity of the lake. The Fishlake route designation plan proposes this route be designated a non-motorized trail. The Forest Travel Plan Amendment should be designed to aid management of out-of-control use that persists on the Fishlake NF, particularly in this location. Efforts must be made to establish vegetation, enforce closures, and rehabilitate damage already done by ORVs.

161	16	P	NRMGT.302 00	620	Attachment photo 10: Both these trails, currently called "non-motorized", are violated frequently by ATVs. These trails feed a large network of non-motorized trails that have seen illegal ORV use for some time. Both relatively remote, enforcement is already a problem here. As a part of route designation, greater efforts must be made to stop violations of non-motorized trails such as these.
161	17	P	NRMGT.302 00	620	Attachment map 11: Another example from the same general area as location 10, this route is currently closed to motorized vehicles. The route, as with those in location 10, is not signed, bermed, nor has any attempt been made to control illegal use. This trail also serves a large network of non-motorized trails that has witnessed years of improper use by ORVs.

Public Concern Number 306

Public Concern Order 26

Public Concern The Forest Service should require licenses for ATVs on the Fishlake National Forest: a) to generate funds for motorized recreation management, b) to improve enforcement of the motorized travel plan.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
48	6	I	NRMGT.302 00	1	As a side note, I also support ATV license plates that require an education class and signage large enough to identify and report irresponsible riders.
173	17	P	NRMGT.302 00	100	How can ORV riders be licensed? Every state in the nation requires a license to drive a motor vehicle. A part of the contract for receiving a license is the agreement that the license holder is responsible to know the law. This same principle should be applied to people driving ORVs. Users should be required to know

Public Concern Number 307

Public Concern Order 27

Public Concern The Forest Service should increase the penalties for OHV violations: a) to increase compliance with the motorized travel plan rules, b) to fund additional law enforcement, c) to fund repair of environmental damaged caused by OHVs.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
-------------	--------------	----------------	---------------	------------------	----------------

6	1	I	NRMGT.302 00	620	I agree with you 100%, OHV riders need a place to ride. Give it to them, then insist they stay on it. Any ATV found off designated trails or roads or areas should be impounded and vehicle auctioned off. Proceeds going to improve or repair damage done.
50	2	I	NRMGT.302 00	300	I strongly believe that it is a fringe element of off-roaders who insist they have the right to drive wherever they wish that creates these illegal trails, making responsible four-wheelers look bad. The damage that can be done to natural areas by these vehicles is massive because of their number, quick, and very hard to repair. There must be a travel plan, and it must be enforced, by large fines if
10	3	I	NRMGT.302 00	300	ATV's operated irresponsibly can do much damage. The people who do this need to be addressed. Possibly banned from the National Forests, or confiscate their OHV.
173	15	P	NRMGT.302 00	100	How can the Forest Service or any federal land management agency increase penalties for infractions? How large can the penalties be? Can the penalties extend to confiscating illegally used off-road vehicles? What levels of penalty have been shown to deter off-road vehicle users from riding illegally? What probability of apprehension has been shown to deter off-road vehicles from riding illegally? These are questions the Travel Plan must consider.

Public Concern Number 308

Public Concern Order 28

Public Concern The Forest Service should increase public education efforts related to motorized recreation and OHV use: a) to improve compliance with motorized travel plan rules, b) to promote public safety, c) to protect natural resources, d) to reduce user conflicts, e) to avoid having to resort to eliminating motorized access.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
67	3	I	RECRE.504 10	305	I feel this impact [to the overall forest condition] can be kept to a minimum only through education of all users and include an emphasis on younger riders as well as strong enforcement. I am an OHV rider so continued access is important to me but proper management is necessary.
43	3	I	RECRE.504 10	1	Education is a major part of the Forest's Travel Plan. Public meetings, information stations on the forest, handout maps and enforcement is vital to its success.

152	22	RM	RECRE.504 10	620	Most problems associated with recreation can be addressed by education. Education should be the first line of action and all education measures should be exhausted before pursuing other actions. The elimination of much needed recreational opportunities is not reasonable without first exhausting all possible means of education to address the problem. Educational programs could include use of mailings, handouts, improved travel management mapping, pamphlets, TV and radio spots, web pages, newspaper articles, signing, presentations, information kiosks with mapping, and trail rangers. Suggestion: a) FS should incorporate a vigorous recreational education program into all management alternatives.
152	24	RM	RECRE.504 10	610	7. General comments on OHV planning: b) Proper education programs and service programs must be an important focus of the Travel Plan. This emphasis should be a key part to avoiding social user conflicts by providing education to public lands visitors so they utilize the lands suitable for their mode of recreation. For instance, in order to reduce social conflict, the plan should provide for the education of pedestrian and equestrian users about the availability of areas that meet their recreation opportunity setting both in the Forest as well as on adjacent public lands or National Parks.
152	39	RM	RECRE.504 10	610	USA-ALL believes that proper management is the key to reducing conflict and suggests that other management options, aside from closure, be implemented. Such options could include, but certainly would not be limited to: 1) Educating the non motorized visitors about when and where they may encounter vehicle traffic as well as informing them of areas where they may avoid such encounters.2) Educating the vehicle-assisted visitor of where the road or trail might be shared with non-motorized visitors, and encouraging slower speeds and a more courteous ethic in these areas

Public Concern Number 401

Public Concern Order 29

Public Concern *The Forest Service should improve management of motorized recreation: a) to protect natural resources, b) to improve the recreational opportunities for motorized users, c) to improve the recreational opportunities for non-motorized users, d) to assure better compliance with motorized travel plan rules, e) to address future growth of motorized use.*

Issue Number

Ltr#	Cmnt#	OrgType	Action	Rationale	Comment
47	1	I	ALTER.2000 0	301	Last month my wife and I stayed in Torrey during a visit to southeast Utah a month ago, and we saw many cases of off-highway vehicles causing damage to the land. We commend the Forest Service for undertaking this planning effort. It is not a moment too soon.
3	1	I	RECRE.531 00	610	I am certainly not opposed to vehicle use of Federal land, I just would like to see it controlled in such a way that it doesn't infringe on hunting and the true wilderness experience. Personally I would rather have an ATV trail through my back yard in yuppyville than to have one bust up my opportunity to hunt big game in the back woods. As I have stated before, the two are compatible so long as the ATVs run on a schedule that does not interfere with the hunt. British Columbia has done it, I see no reason why we can't.
153	1	RM	TRANS.4000 0	300	A very important part of our organization is "protecting the land and access to it". We enjoy riding our OHV's on the existing routes throughout the forest trail system and generally don't support harmful cross country travel without a purpose. We promote responsible use and respect of the land and have worked hard to try and keep the trails clean of trash and in good repair. We have partnered with you many times in repairing damaged areas and even in closing routes with problems. These things all go to the protecting the land" part of our mission. The other part of our mission-----"protecting access to it" is what we need to address now.
88	1	I	ALTER.2351 0	1	I support the OHV enthusiast's and think the management plan in place at Fishlake has been wonderful and my compliments to all involved.

176	1	I	RECRE.531 00	2	My family and friends have all spent great amounts of time on the Fishlake and Manti Forest Trail systems. I think it has been great to see the amount of effort and the results that have given us these well managed trails. I have heard many comments that if only other districts had this kind of management that we would have a much better handles on the issues that concern all outdoor users. I have a cabin on the Acord Lake property and have enjoyed hunting, fishing and a lot of ATV riding on the Fish Lake area. Please keep up the great work. My sons and I are members of the Dedicated Hunter program, Blue Ribbon Coalition and Utah Shared Access. We have and will continue to donate time to any Forest District that can and will use our help to maintain these trails. Thanks again for all your great management.
65	1	I	PRCSS.1210 0	2	I know the generalize directive to ban ATV's from cross country travel has come from the "home office". I also know that this is NOT based upon good "sound" science. It is not designed to serve the public as a whole on an equal basis, but because the Forest Service does not have the ability, the adaptability, the flexibility, the funds, or the manpower, to manage the activity properly. The USDA-FS has labeled OHV's as an un-managed recreation, not because it can not be managed, but because USDA-FS has not learned how to manage it yet. Banning or prohibiting OHV's is controlling but not management. Trying to present this plan in any other way is misleading and deceptive.
99	1	I	RECRE.501 00	1	I have taken a little time to look through your website as it relates to travel planning for OHV use. I just want to let you know that I am very supportive of your continuing to actively manage OHV use in the forest and to provide for lots of access opportunities. As you continue to plan I would like to be made aware of the planning process so I can participate.
29	1	I	NRMGT.302 00	620	There are a number of motorized routes that dead-end into non-motorized routes. These will be difficult to manage - may be easier if they are designated one or the other.

162	1	I	RECRE.531 00	2	<p>I expect that the Forest people are talking about which areas to keep open and which areas to close. As far as OHV comments go, the first thing I would not like to wake up to, is an irrevocable hands off rule for OHV'S. Perhaps a better plan would be to make periodic rules for rotating access to the proposed closings. Please bear with me as I explain and give additional suggestions. Erosion is like fire, its been around for centuries ... just look at the Grand Canyon. I'm sure in the beginning someone would have said that that's ugly. It seems all the rage for some Forest-type people to document in films etc. how we have come to view fire as healthy for the forests, all the while remembering that it was the early mantra that all forest fires were bad, and ugly. What I'm saying here is that the erosion caused by OHV's is not the end of the world so please don't respond by acting as if it is the end of the world-by adopting a hands off policy. Perhaps the best lessons can be learned from the farmer, who on some years (or multiple years) does not grow anything but simply adds TLC from the owner (governing agencies in this case).</p>
165	1	I	RECRE.531 00	2	<p>We appreciate the opportunity for input. Growing up in the Richfield area and spending most of our summers and falls enjoying the Fishlake National Forest has been a privilege, our memories will last a lifetime. Apparently, there is now a need to try to control travel in this area due to the disrespectful actions of a certain group of motorists, specifically off road vehicles (4 wheelers). They seem to be at the root of all our problems. They are the ones who leave the roads and cause damage to meadows and hillsides. They are the ones who go around gates, cut fences, and vandalize cabins and property during the off-season. They are the ones who create the biggest impact to our roads due to the number of vehicles it takes to get a group of four to a destination. These are the motorists that need to be restricted.</p>

103	1	RM	RECRE.531 00	1	<p>The vast majority of Vehicle Assisted Recreation (VARA) activities in the forest take place on existing roads and trails. If sufficient opportunities are provided, there will be little need or desire for cross-country travel. A problem arises, however, because the agencies generally regard VARA as an undesirable activity that needs suppression rather than management. Much mention is made of the "explosion" of VARA users in recent years. If such an "explosion" of hikers or bikers occurred in an area, forest managers would be working hard to accommodate their needs. New trails would be built, old trails would be improved, parking lots and trails heads would be constructed and everyone would be happy. But if more VARA users are attracted to an area, the response is quite the opposite, these people are not politically correct, and thus trails are closed and opportunities denied. In general, whether the controlling agency be the Forest Service, the BLM, or the NPS, the response is always the same: More VARA demand = less service and access. This is always the case even if VARA is the dominant use in the area in question. Each new plan boils down to how many routes will be closed to VA" people.</p>
57	1	I	TRANS.4000 0	300	<p>I am very concerned about impact of population on our forests and more concerned about ORV's that create dusty vegetation decimated trails where they are allowed. Instead of giving free roam to ORV's create an ORV park somewhere that would not endanger forests. Much like the dog parks in SLC, UT. Dogs do far less damage than horses, cattle and far less than ORVs but ORVs seem to roam free and I can barely run my dog. This isn't sour grapes as much as it is fear that ORV's do not and will not stay on trails if designated (that isn't fun I guess) consequently will ruin our forests more than they are currently allowed...or in some places not allowed.</p>

121	1	I	RECRE.531 00	810	<p>LaDon is from Milford, Utah and I am from Dallas, Texas. We live in Arlington (a suburb of Dallas) and visit LaDon's family in Milford and Beaver every year. In August 2003, we were fortunate to be able to purchase property in the National Forest.</p> <p>A one acre home site above the Little Reservoir in the Hi-Lo development. We now have water, electricity and septic on site and look forward to building a home in the years ahead. Because we have spent so many years living in a large city with the noise and air pollution, we treasure any time we can be on a mountain. We plan on leaving our one acre as untouched as possible. The last thing I want is to be reminded of the noise and pollution of the city. Several of LaDon's family members have 4-wheelers and we have told them to please leave the bikes at home when they come to visit on the mountain. I understand the Forest Service may want to provide an area for this recreation. My plea is to keep them as far away as possible from any home sites.</p>
109	1	I	RECRE.531 00	300	<p>I am happy to see you are leading the effort to address the growing problem of off road vehicle use on the lands of the Fishlake National Forest. I last visited Fishlake National Forest about a year ago and was considerably distressed to see the number of off road vehicles and their resulting trails on the forest land - a considerable increase in both from my previous visit several years prior. Your efforts to control this problem are appreciated.</p>
167	1	I	TRANS.4000 0	690	<p>After looking at the plan OHV routes on the Fish Lake National Forest. I am pleased with the Forest Service plan to regulate ATV use on the Forest. The Shingle Creek Trail closures and the ban on cross country travel are long over due. I compliment the Forest Service for getting a handle on the exploding ATV use on the Forest.</p>
78	2	I	RECRE.531 10	690	<p>In the 10 years I have lived here, I have noticed a significant increase in the volume of OHV traffic on the Fishlake NF each year. I have felt strongly that the USFS needed to take action to better manage OHV use on the forest. I applaud the efforts of the Fishlake NF to apply controls</p>
21	2	I	RECRE.531 00	300	<p>I am not an ORV user but I recognize it as a legitimate form of recreation. However, rules must be in place in our National Forests to control the astronomical growth in the numbers of these vehicles, and the potential negative impact their unbridled use will have on vegetation and wildlife habitat.</p>

19	2	I	RECRE.531 00	300	The Forest Service has an opportunity to strictly limit any more damage from OHVs by limiting their access to the greatest degree possible in the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project. OHVs are destructive of wildlife habitat, sound-scapes for miles around, the plants totally destroyed the wheels, and the visual horror of all this destruction. Much too much damage has already occurred.
196	2	I	RECRE.504 10	2	We were impressed by the guides that lead all of our rides. Their emphasis was always on SAFETY, RESPECT other trail users, DO NOT harass wildlife, STAY ON THE TRAIL, pack out your LITTER!! They have done an excellent job of protecting the trail
171	2	I	RECRE.531 00	300	Background. I think it important to understand that while I have traveled extensively throughout the United States and have visited and enjoyed experiences in other national forests, I consider the Fishlake National Forest my home forest--the one that I have spent a significant amount of my life exploring and enjoying. That having been said, I feel that our national forest system, and the Fishlake in particular is under attack, suffering from a blight as potentially devastating as any in history. The blight I refer to is caused by man and comes in the form of unrestrained motorized vehicles or off highway vehicles as they are commonly known. Having just returned from three days on the Fishlake I saw the evidence of abuse everywhere I traveled, to include that portion of the "Great Western Trail" extending North of I-70.
168	2	I	RECRE.531 00	510	I ALSO SAW EVIDENCE OF EXCELLENT TRAIL MANAGEMENT AND A WELL LAID OUT TRAIL SYSTEM. I DID NOT SEE ANY EVIDENCE OF ABUSE BY RIDERS GOING OFF THE TRAIL, DESTROYING PROPERTY OR REEKING HAVOC ANYWHERE. EVERYONE SEEMS TO BE THERE FOR THE SAME THING, TO ENJOY THEIR PUBLIC FORESTS ON THEIR ATV'S.
102	3	I	TRANS.4000 0	300	I am very concerned that the public agencies are 'behind the curve' in addressing this user issue and that it has possibly become the #1 threat to OUR public lands. Please take an aggressive and proactive approach regarding this in your upcoming Travel Plan so our great-grandchildren can enjoy the forest

152	3	RM	TRANS.4105 0	1	Regarding Unlicensed Vehicles on Forest Roads: This issue has been raised in oral and written comments to the FS by members and supporters of Blue Ribbon Coalition (BRC). In general, the FS should consider forest roads potential infrastructure for OHV use, including unlicensed vehicles. Issues such as safety and issues resulting in other possible restrictions should be identified and managed on a site specific, or route by route basis. Where appropriate, roads should remain open for unlicensed vehicles. Where conflicts exist, the FS should employ mitigation measures such as signing and speed limits. Where such measures aren't feasible, the FS should not preclude the construction of additional travel ways to facilitate OHV management.
175	4	I	RECRE.531 00	690	The recreational demands placed on our national forests are only going to increase in the future. It's important that the Forest Service balance the multitude of interests involved. Careless and negligent motorized use can create a lot of damage in a short amount of time.
157	4	I	RECRE.531 00	811	We love the outdoors and riding is one thing our family can do together please don't take this away from us.
118	4	I	TRANS.4000 0	300	The Paiute and Great Western 4 wheel ATV only are a mess both for the environment and the natural beauty of the area. Hillsides now have trails and paths never
-13	5	I	RECRE.531 00	690	The Forest Service proposal also fails to plan for the future, and fails to consider what the next 15-20 years of ORV technology and population growth will bring to these forest lands. The use level is certainly not going to decrease or stay at its current level; it is sure to increase.
18	6	I	NRMGT.300 00	2	Thank you for using good planning to protecting the roadless, undeveloped areas for wildlife habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities.
180	7	I	RECRE.531 00	180	I think that the Utah laws should be changed to allow for ATV travel on the backcountry gravel roads to allow us to get from one ATV trail to another.
-16	7	I	RECRE.531 00	690	In addition, the proposal must be revised to address what the next 15-20 years of ORV technology and population growth will bring to these forest lands. The use level is certainly not going to decrease or stay at its current level; it is sure to increase.
171	7	I	RECRE.531 00	1	2. The Fishlake OHV Route Designation Situation. It is my contention that: d. That trail management on the Fishlake has historically been reactive.

152 9 RM RECRE.531 2
00

C. Regarding OHV and recreation management¹. Comment: There is an increasing demand for OHV recreation opportunities on public lands and National Forests. The Forest Service, as well as environmental groups, state and local governments and OHV and recreational access organizations have all acknowledged that many Forest Plans formulated in the 1980's woefully failed to anticipate the increased public demand for all types of outdoor recreation and related OHV uses. The Bureau of Land Management's National OHV Strategy states: "Motorized off-highway vehicle use on public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has increased substantially in recent years. ? Some of [the factors contributing to growing OHV popularity] are: ? greater public interest in unconfined outdoor recreational opportunities; ? rising disposable income ? advances in vehicle technology ? the rapid growth of the West's cities and suburbs ? a population with an increasing median age with changing outdoor recreational interests. This [growing OHV] popularity is evidenced by the fact that recreational enthusiasts are buying OHV's at the rate of 1,500 units per day nationwide, with nearly one-third of them doing so as first-time buyers."^[1] "[BLM's OHV] Strategy recognizes, as does policy outlined in BLM Manual 8340 (May 25, 1982), that off-road vehicle use is an 'acceptable use of public land wherever it is compatible with established resource management objectives.' As established by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), the BLM is required to manage public lands on the basis of multiple use and sustained yield, while protecting natural values. ? Motorized OHV use is now firmly established as a major recreational activity

152	10	RM	RECRE.531 00	2	Unwisely, rather than work to accommodate the increased demand for OHV recreation, BLM and many National Forests have frequently reacted by restricting OHV opportunities. But more importantly, opportunities to manage OHV use by marking roads and trails, providing usable maps, identifying OHV trails and systems and entering into cooperative management agreements with OHV user groups have, by and large, been ignored by the BLM. Although more pro-active management is clearly permissible within the existing management plans, a quick search on the BLM's and National Forest's websites indicates that land managers more often choose to implement parts of their OHV policy associated with limitations and closures. IMPORTANT NOTE: The Fishlake NF is an exception to this rule. The designation and management of the Paiute trail system is truly a remarkable achievement. USA-ALL applauds the Fishlake NF for the manner in which they have pro-actively managed OHV recreation. This pro-active management is in stark contrast to that of the Dixie NF where, except in very few isolated cases, OHV use has all but been ignored.
108	11	I	RECRE.531 00	2	The Forest Service proposal also fails to plan for the future, and fails to consider what the next 15-20 years of ORV technology and population growth will bring to these forest lands. It certainly does not account for the diminishing oil supplies coupled with increased demand from population growth. The ORV use level is certainly not going to decrease or stay at its current level; it is sure to increase if left unchecked. The Forest Service must be pro-active and plan for this increased use, by protecting the roadless, undeveloped areas for wildlife habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities.
63	14	I	RECRE.531 00	350	Equipment restrictions should be put in place to ensure that air pollution is reduced and minimized. All OHV and other motorized vehicles should be restricted to only those with the more efficient, less-polluting four-stroke engines. It is appropriate for the Forest to define a time-phased implementation of this requirement, but it must be limited to a specific period of time of less than ten years, and it must not be allowed to slip.

65	18	I	RECRE.531 00	840	Restricting, banning, prohibiting are methods for controlling, BUT not for managing activities. Restricting, banning, and prohibiting are methods to STOP the activity. Managing is like a traffic cop at an intersection directing traffic, telling the traffic what to do. Restricting, banning, and prohibiting is like that same traffic cop at that same intersection STOPPING all traffic (or only one kind of vehicle) from utilizing that intersection! What the USDA-FS needs to remember is the National Forest is PUBLIC land, owned by "WE the PEOPLE". The USDA-FS has been "hired" by "We the People" to manage this land for OUR benefit, not theirs. This land needs to be managed to benefit ALL the people, EQUALLY, not favoring one or more activities over others. Even if the USDA-FS needs to work a little harder to get the job done!
152	18	RM	RECRE.531 00	620	Suggestions: f) The Planning Team should avoid overly restrictive management prescriptions that limit the land manager's ability to respond to changing recreational patterns.
161	18	P	NRMGT.302 00	620	Attachment photo 12: Another non-motorized trail in the same general area as locations 10 and 11, this trail points to a lack of enforcement and proactive management. Like the others, this trail contains no signage, no berms, and no traffic control devices of any kind. Photo 2 shows the trail fording Shingle Mill Creek.

152	21	RM	RECRE.531 00	2	<p>The FS has never been proactive in providing the access and recreational routes needed by the public. Very little of FS's recreational travel route inventory was "planned". The vast majority of routes used by recreationists were constructed for other purposes such as logging, mining or access to grazing allotments. If the general public waited for the federal land managers to "plan" recreational travel ways they would still be waiting. OHV users, therefore, are unfairly criticized for the increase in "resource conflicts", and "proliferation of new, unplanned roads and trails". Although these are important concerns that must be addressed in this planning effort, the situation is not reflective of "out of control" OHV users as much as indicator of the unmet demand for recreational infrastructure. All too often, recreationists must resort to creating valuable recreational experiences by themselves, with no guidance, input or assistance from land managers. Routes originally constructed for mineral location and development and livestock grazing have been connected and are now used for recreational purposes. Land managers have created little in the way of recreational opportunity.</p> <p>Suggestions: a) FS should use valid recreational management principles, i.e., providing a variety of experiences, challenges, including loop trails, trails to breathtaking views, connecting existing routes etc. b) Consider proliferation of new, unplanned roads and trails as signs of the recreation staff not keeping up with demand. Think, "transportation planning", not "travel management". Think in terms of providing recreational experience, not in terms of punishing the public for searching for such experience.</p>
152	25	RM	RECRE.531 00	620	<p>7. General comments on OHV planning: c) Common standards for management should be considered for adoption in the Travel Plan. One such standard should be to maintain, reconstruct, and relocate existing roads and trails to reduce resource impacts. Emphasis should first be given to maintenance, reconstruction, and relocation of roads before closures are considered.</p>

Public Concern Number 402

Public Concern Order 30

Public Concern *The Forest Service should provide a "balance" between motorized and non-motorized recreation and its responsibility to protect the environment a) to assure that current and future recreational opportunities are provided for each interest, b) to comply with NFMA's multiple-use mandate, c) to protect natural resources, d) to promote public adherence to the motorized travel plan.*

Issue Number

Ltr#	Cmnt#	OrgType	Action	Rationale	Comment
153	-6	RM	RECRE.501 00	620	<p>At the meeting it was brought out that any time any "compromise" plan is instigated, it is always the motorized groups that suffer.</p> <p>We agree that there needs to be non-motorized trails and areas for quiet and solitude. We would even go as far as to help in building such trails if necessary, but what usually happens is someone says we need to "compromise" and quit driving on some of our trails so they can be non-motorized. So in essence we are giving up access to our existing trails, but the non-motorized groups are only receiving the opportunity to use the trail without having to see a motorized user. What did they give up in their part of the "compromise"? They would say that they gave up some of what they wanted... they didn't get everything they wanted, but they are not giving up anything that they already had. After all is said and done, they can still hike on virtually every square inch of ground in the forest, while our access is continually being taken away! We would be much more willing to give up some trails if we knew we could open some new trails in return.</p>
12	1	I	TRANS.4000 0	300	<p>I'm writing as someone who is interested in a plan for balanced future land use at Fishlake. Please send me more information and also please include my name among those who vote for a carefully crafted plan for the future of this area which will be heavily impacted with a million destructive little roads if precautions are not taken now.</p>
15	1	P	RECRE.501 00	610	<p>I am a frequent traveler to southern Utah and wish to comment on your plans to designate ohv routes in the Fishlake region.</p> <p>As a hiker and backpacker nothing ruins my experience more than a motor vehicle in a pristine setting. Please set aside sufficient areas that are closed to motorized use as we need to balance the need of all lovers of the land.</p>

61	1	I	RECRE.501 00	810	<p>I live in Wayne County and I am writing to please urge you to greatly limit the area that ORVs are allowed in your upcoming consideration of the ORV route designation project. I used to enjoy camping, canoeing and hiking on Monroe Mountain and in the Tushar Range, but no more. Little dirt roads and trails that used to be pleasant for walking or bicycling, or even 4 wheel driving on, have become ATV highways. All of a sudden, a tremendous noise comes rushing around the corner and a family of ATVers with 6 ATVs will come racing aggressively by, not slowing a bit and leaving me in an echoing roar of noise and huge clouds of dust. And this happens over and over again in the course of a day. I can't tell you how unpleasant it is. I doubt I'll ever try to enjoy Monroe Mountain again.</p>
22	1	I	RECRE.501 00	630	<p>As you approach the new travel plan for the Fishlake forest, I'd like to submit this comment - your travel plan must protect my right as a non-motorized user of your forest, every bit as much as it accommodates the needs of motorized users. I love to camp in the mountains. Having camped in all three of your forests numerous times over the past 10 years, I can say without a doubt that there are way too many trails available for motorized use. They need to be reduced in number. That means closing some roads and trails to motorized use. Here's my beef, in a nutshell: I find it impossible anymore to locate areas that are free from the noise of motors and tracks of tires. If I wanted to camp in places like that I could just stay home in the city and lay awake at night listening to the sounds of the streets. Remember when camping in the mountains meant a sky full of stars and the quiet sounds of nature? In your forests, it's becoming difficult to have that simple experience. The mountains are supposed to be a refuge from the congestion of the city, but lately it seems they're becoming almost as overrun with motorized traffic. On one trip a few years ago with my girlfriend, we drove from Loa north up into the mountains to find a quiet, undeveloped place to camp for the night. We ended up driving completely over the mountains and almost all the way down into Salina in our search for one peaceful place. We couldn't find a single spot that wasn't overrun by motorized mayhem. We ended up sharing a narrow ravine with a large group that had a number of ATVs. It might seem that sharing a space like that shouldn't be a problem, but it was. While we took up virtually none of their "space" -- their noise, lights, dust, and tracks took up the space</p>
37	1	I	TRANS.4000 0	1	<p>On the Beaver District, I would support all open and closed trails to the Kimberly area.</p>

76	1	I	RECRE.501 00	620	I understand that there are pressures being mounted by anti OHV activists that claim that the recent proposed travel plan is to ATV friendly and does not meet their goals, their goal being the elimination of all motorized travel on all national forests and other public lands. I think that the proposed plan addresses relevant issues and has the interests of all concerned parties considered. The anti's want one viewpoint considered and that is their viewpoint.
178	1	I	RECRE.501 00	1	I have already submitted comments but due to the experience of spending a night camped at Big John's Flat last weekend, I feel compelled to submit more. I continue to be strongly in favor of the proposed plan. I think it treats all users of the forest in an equitable way. Lest you be persuaded to make more existing trails accessible to motorized vehicles
117	1	I	RECRE.501 00	630	I strongly oppose adding to the current ATV trail network or expanding existing trails. In my opinion the forest is already providing more than enough opportunity for ATV users and foot and horse trails and roadless areas are under-represented.
162	2	I	RECRE.501 00	610	Obviously someone there in your governmental agency has thought about the various levels of road to off road experiences. In recent years I have been depressed to see what has happened to the skyline drive around Joe's valley. At one time it was an incredible four wheel drive only area. Now you have monster 5' wheel trailers and motorhome types up there. What I am talking about is with an open/closed policy it seems that freeways develop where there used to be 4 wheel drive roads, on the other extreme, I have recently visited four wheel drive roads which are now 4 wheeler roads. This level of country experience is what's truly on the endangered list. These field- level experiences should be classified and measured. The increase in 4 wheeler sales is telling you that there should be motorcycles wheeler and jeep type roads-not gravel skyline drive freeways. Northern Utah should have its own Piute ATV trail system. We should have Moab Jeep trail areas around this state as well. There should be some horse trail areas, but the solution is not to make more of these areas inaccessible forever but to rotate them. This should be so that everyone can truly decide without taking away the will of the public, by creating laws that have almost no recall short an act of congress to reclaim the access that the true will of the majority will want and will wake up to for its public lands.

16	2	I	RECRE.501 00	300	As a result of my experience, I request from you a complete ban of OHV use in the Fishlake National Forest. I request that this ban include so-called four-wheelers, three-wheelers, motorcycles, snowmobiles, power boats, mountain bicycles and all other mechanical means of transportation. I understand that you must fairly balance requests from many perspectives. My note today will hopefully be taken as a polite request from the side of eliminating OHV use in the Fishlake National Forest.
-13	2	I	RECRE.501 00	300	Rather than allowing the forest to become overrun with roads and trails, the Forest Service should balance motorized access and motorized recreation with other resource values and recreational uses of the forest lands.
63	2	I	RECRE.501 00	2	BALANCE and COMPROMISE must serve as the most critical guiding principles of the Fishlake Travel Plan. For example, the damage OHV traffic does to the Forests' clean water generation qualities, wildlife habitat resources, and OHV's disproportionate impact to the experiences of hikers, bird-watchers, and other non-motorized (low-impact and quiet) recreational users must be considered fairly. A balanced approach will thus cause the Travel Plan to minimize opportunities and acreage on which OHV activities are allowed.
62	2	I	RECRE.501 00	600	There is enough closed areas that are only being used by a few. I want public lands to be accessible and useable. The majority of recreationists want convenient access as
60	2	I	RECRE.501 00	600	There is enough closed areas that are only being used by a few. I want public lands to be accessible and useable. The majority of recreationists want convenient access as
59	2	I	RECRE.501 00	2	I believe that rather than allowing the forest to become overrun with roads and trails, the Forest Service should balance motorized access and motorized recreation with other resource values and recreational uses of the forest lands.
-16	2	I	RECRE.501 00	630	I am also concerned that this proposal may place unfair emphasis or preference on motorized recreation, at the expense of non-motorized recreation and other resource uses and values
55	2	I	RECRE.531 00	2	I think the Forest Service should balance motorized access and motorized recreation with other resource values and recreational uses of the forest lands.
18	2	I	RECRE.501 00	1	Please make sure that the plan you develop provides for a balanced use of the area-- motorized use should not be a top

61	2	I	RECRE.501 00	2	<p>I'm all for having certain trails (like the Paiute Trail) officially designated for the pleasure of ATVers, and think it is great that they can travel long distances on a trail and really make a good excursion of it.</p> <p>And since it is well marked as an ATV trail, I know to stay way away from it. But please don't allow ORV use everywhere, because then there will be nothing but noise and dust for the rest of us--no wildlife along the trails, no more bird watching, no quiet, no place to enjoy nature in its true colors - and this is something that most states in this country have already lost. Please don't let Utah become motorized like everywhere else. The Fishlake area is rare and beautiful. Please keep it that way.</p>
108	3	I	TRANS.4000 0	1	<p>I have backpacked the Skyline Trail; climbed Mount Holly and communed with the goats there, hiked over City Creek and Lake Peaks, and generally enjoyed the trail.</p> <p>I have also hiked Delano and other area peaks. I have been struck by the carnage along and sprawled out from the Paiute ATV trail. What a waste of resources, what damage to wildlife corridors, how un-American, given our dependence on foreign oil. All current ORV use should be restricted to the main Paiute trail, ONLY (no spurs, no self-made ways).</p>
168	3	I	RECRE.501 00	620	<p>THE PROPOSED ACTION WILL DESIGNATE SPECIFIC ROUTES AND AREAS OPEN FOR MOTORIZED USE AND WILL CLOSE THE FOREST TO OFF-ROAD MOTORIZED CROSS-COUNTRY TRAVEL BY OHV'S, WHILE LEAVING THESE SAME AREAS OPEN TO THOSE TRAVELING ON HORSEBACK, HIKING, CROSS-COUNTRY SKIERS AND SNOWMOBILERS. PLEASE DO NOT LET THIS SMALL INTEREST GROUP RUIN THE WHOLESOME RECREATIONAL EXPERIENCE FOR THE REST OF US</p>
98	3	I	RECRE.501 00	610	<p>I question whether this truly represents an effort to create a Multiple Use management plan; doesn't it put too much weight on the desires of one very specific group (at the expense of other forest users). It seems that you are setting the Forest up for expensive litigation (that will surely follow such a plan), diverting limited fiscal resources away from more worthy projects.</p>

91	3	I	RECRE.501 00	810	OHV enthusiasts are overwhelmingly positive about the outdoor experience on the Paiute trail. Many of those that are not able to back pack 30 miles into a wilderness area have benefited by these experiences on the Paiute trail. I can reflect on the my feelings with my sons as we come down through moose canyon, between Koosharem and Otter Creek. It was one with nature, of awe of the beauty, the silence as we sat there and enjoyed this ride. It was this type of experience that I urge you to preserve in your revised travel plan.
58	3	I	NRMGT.300 00	620	There must be a balanced management plan that takes into consideration the preservation and use of natural resources, wildlife, agriculture, and human activities. No one of these can be held above the others. This means finding ways to lower conflict among all users, lower resource damage, and minimizing impact to wildlife.
161	3	P	RECRE.501 00	630	There is already a severe lack of recreational balance on the Fishlake, with many more opportunities available for ORV recreationists. It is vital that the interests of quiet recreationists not be trumped by the "wish lists" of mo-rec enthusiasts.
-50	3	I	RECRE.501 00	1	Rather than allowing the forest to become overrun with roads and trails, the Forest Service should balance motorized access and motorized recreation with other resource values and recreational uses of the forest lands.
178	3	I	RECRE.501 00	840	I continue to believe that OHVs have a right to use designated trails and would oppose any attempt to deprive them of that right. I only believe that those of us opting for "human-powered" recreation be afforded the same rights.
175	3	I	NRMGT.300 00	300	My wife and I are frequent visitors to Utah and enjoy hiking in the National Parks and public lands. While motorized users of the national forests have a legitimate claims, their use has to be balanced with those of others as well as the need to preserve soils, watersheds, vegetation and wildlife
-13	4	I	RECRE.501 00	300	The current Forest Service proposal does not provide for a balanced and wide spectrum of uses - motorized use appears to be the top priority.

106	4	I	RECRE.501 00	301	Plan Is Out of Balance. The proposed plan goes overboard in letting OHVs run all over the Fishlake National Forest, including roadless areas that are still under consideration for wilderness, areas with high wildlife habitat values, and places where recreationists go seeking solitude and primitive recreation. We urge you to give more consideration to minimizing conflicts among recreational users of the forest and minimizing damage to the natural resources of the forest. The Conservation Alternative will point to specific changes to remedy this imbalance.
55	4	I	RECRE.501 00	1	The current Forest Service proposal does not provide for a balanced and wide spectrum of uses - motorized use appears to be the top priority.
22	4	I	RECRE.501 00	630	We need a travel plan that not only eliminates cross-country travel in every sector, but also reduces the number of trails open to motorized toys, at least in certain sectors. Otherwise, the non-motorized user like me, who just wants to get away from it all for an evening or a week, won't have a single place left to get out of earshot of motors.
58	4	I	RECRE.501 00	300	I believe it is vitally important to protect the future of our roadless and wild areas of the forest, as well as to provide the opportunity for balanced recreational
63	4	I	RECRE.501 00	300	A BALANCED Forest Travel Plan must be developed that recognizes the full costs of damaging Off-Highway Vehicle recreation in comparison to the other less intensive or damaging uses of the Forests' qualities and resources.
59	4	I	RECRE.501 00	1	The current Forest Service proposal does not provide for a balanced and wide spectrum of uses; motorized use appears to be the top priority.
18	5	I	RECRE.501 00	1	The current Forest Service proposal does not provide for a balanced and wide spectrum of uses -- motorized use appears to be the top priority.

48	5	I	RECRE.501 10	811	A good friend of mine was an avid supporter of ATV travel. It was all he had to look forward to because of crippling arthritis. The doctors recently told him he couldn't ride anymore and he sold his ATV. His funeral was Saturday. He was only 59. I can't help but wonder how many people we exclude when we close a road or trail. There are so few hikers and we have designated many wonderful places that can be accessed only on foot or horseback. Why must we continue to restrict beautiful places that no one will ever see again? Please accommodate the ATV rider whenever possible.
63	5	I	RECRE.501 00	2	The Forest Travel Plan must address the desires of different Forest users as well. Although OHV users have a right to pursue their activity within the Forest, because of the disproportionate negative impacts of OHV use, it is only right that the majority of the Forest's lands be off-limits to their
-16	5	I	RECRE.501 00	2	I believe that the Forest Service can and should strike a better balance between motorized recreation and other resource values and recreational uses.
47	5	I	RECRE.501 00	2	Lack of Balance: The plan as proposed seems to make OHVs a dominant use of the forest. The plan lacks a reasonable balance between OHVs on one hand, and non-motorized recreation, wildlife habitat, and health of the land on the other. Under this plan, OHVs would cause continuing damage in roadless areas and key wildlife habitat areas.
159	6	I	RECRE.501 00	620	Whatever the case, as I have already stated, I consider myself an avid, dedicated ATV recreational rider, and feel that it is my right. I deserve full consideration and equal access to the wonders and recreational opportunities available on the forest, as much so as anyone else. Right now I do not feel that this is the case, even though I am required to pay licensing fees, and comply to a great many restrictions, enjoying much less freedom and access than others who are afforded these opportunities for free. It is my opinion that there needs to be a big time change of attitude locally and across the board on the part of the Forest Service toward the ATV and those who choose to ride them.

-13	6	I	NRMGT.300 00	300	The Forest Service must be pro-active and plan for this increased use, by protecting the roadless, undeveloped areas for wildlife habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities. I urge you to accept these suggestions for a more balanced plan. I visit Utah frequently and I am appalled at how many ORV trails have scarred the landscape in just the last few years. Flying a small plane, the damage is incredibly
103	6	RM	PRCSS.1010 0	620	The Utah Shared Access Alliance is a signatory organization to the American Public, Lands Equal Access Protocol that states: THE AMERICAN PUBLIC LANDS EQUAL ACCESS PROTOCOL Whereas Federal Land Management Agencies are under significant pressure to close or otherwise restrict historical and traditional vehicle access to public lands. Whereas vehicle access and recreation on public lands is considered only as a marginally legitimate activity by Federal Land Management Agencies. Whereas there is a need to affirm the right of all persons to access and experience America's public lands. Signatory organizations agree to advance the these principles in the formulation of federal public lands policies: Article 1: No discrimination against any access modality. All have a right to participate in the public lands experience. No access modality shall have superior rights over others. Article 2: Equal Footing with other laws. Broad-spectrum access to public lands is a resource whose value must not be diminished by legislation regarding other issues concerning public land management and use. It must be respected and considered with equal standing in regard to all land use planning and mitigation activities. Article 3: No Net Loss of Access. If any access modality is restricted in a particular area due to planning or mitigation needs, then an equivalent access opportunity must be simultaneously created. In accordance with these principles the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project must implement the following:
46	7	P	RECRE.501 00	163	The R.O.S. should be used in this process and ALL atv/moto-X trails created in "semi-primitive non-motorized areas" under the '86 LRMP ROS should be closed to motorized use.
151	7	I	RECRE.531 00	620	There are so many scenic & historical areas to see here. People come from all over to enjoy them - including from other states and abroad. The majority of these people using the extended mountain routes do not hike, mountain bike or ride horses and seem to be 40-50 years or older. I've noticed the majority of young people & families use the shorter routes close to town or just around their campsites.

-16	8	I	NRMGT.300 00	300	The Forest Service must be pro-active and plan for this increased use, by protecting the roadless, undeveloped areas for wildlife habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities.
63	8	I	RECRE.501 00	1	I believe that the Forest Service must not allow the Fishlake NF to become overrun with motorized roads and trails. I feel that the Forest Service should balance motorized access and motorized recreation with all the other resource values and recreational uses of the forest.
108	8	I	RECRE.501 00	1	I would like to see you: Rather than allowing the forest to become overrun with roads and trails, the Forest Service should balance motorized access and motorized recreation with other resource values and recreational uses of the forest lands. The best balance for our country, given the exploding population and the pressure on all diminishing oil sources is to totally eliminate the use of ORVs on public lands.-minimize conflict among users by phasing out the use of ORVs on public lands.
46	9	P	RECRE.501 00	510	The base map, by including nearly every known trail, route and road does not represent a balance, and should not be promoted as such.
151	9	I	RECRE.501 00	620	I noticed on the travel plan map that there were several areas with groupings of either all closed or all open. Perhaps there could be a balance in these areas of open & closed.
108	10	I	RECRE.501 00	610	The current Forest Service proposal does not provide for a balanced and wide spectrum of uses - motorized use appears to be the top priority. When it is a top priority, it becomes the only user. Instead, I recommend a priority of completely and totally phasing out the use of ORVs on all public lands.
152	11	RM	RECRE.501 00	690	Suggestions: a) The Forest Service cannot legitimately address increasing demand for OHV recreation opportunity by refusing to accommodate such demand. Alternatives must prudently provide for increased OHV recreation opportunities to meet current and anticipated demand.
46	12	P	ALTER.2352 0	2	Please consider the needs of wildlife, equestrians, hikers, backpackers, and hunters who seek a quiet, primitive, remote and natural experience on the Fishlake. The current "Alternative 2" does not provide enough consideration of these groups.

98	12	I	RECRE.501 00	300	This plan is much too heavily weighted on the desires of the most vocal off-road vehicle proponents, and ignores those of the quiet user and natural inhabitants. Our forests are a treasure, not a motorized playground, and should be treated as such. Establishing a reasonable motorized system makes sense; the blanket addition of every known passage does not.
103	13	RM	RECRE.501 00	1	As Federal employees, you have a duty to provide for the needs of all forest users and visitors. To concentrate on discriminating against one user group while the forests are dying all around you serves no useful purpose except to temporarily placate those whose desire for exclusivity will never be satisfied until all VARA people have been driven out. The Utah Shared Access Alliance sincerely hopes that those individuals charged with the development of the motorized travel plan recognize the principles asserted in these comments and produce a product that respects the rights of all people to access and enjoy our public lands.
63	15	I	NRMGT.302 00	2	I feel that it is vitally important that the Forest Service support the proposition that its travel management policy must be balanced and fair to all involved. To run roughshod over the goals and principles of either the OHV users or the advocates for wilderness and quiet recreation will only generate continuous dissent and resentment. This then will lead to an increase in illegal activities and the need for ever greater enforcement expenses - something surely not needed in these tough economic times.
63	19	I	NRMGT.300 00	2	I ask that the Travel Planning team take these principles and the above specific ideas for improvement into account as it works to improve the final Travel Plan. The result will be a BALANCED Travel Plan that meets all the needs and desires of all the Fishlake National Forest users, while preserving its resources for future generations to enjoy also.

Public Concern Number 403

Public Concern Order 31

Public Concern The Forest Service should minimize use/user conflicts between motorized users and other resource uses and values: a) to comply with Executive Orders 11644 and 11989, 36CFR295 and other regulations.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

0	1	I	RECRE.501 00	610	Letter #013: The Forest Service needs to start being much more proactive when dealing with conflicts between user groups that have completely opposite interests (i.e. users who seek peace & quiet and wildlife observation vs. those looking for a motorized sport experience). Population increases and subsequent user increases will only generate more conflict until we as a society recognize that separate areas need to be set aside for these different user-groups.
103	2	RM	SOCEC.700 00	1	User conflict is often mentioned as a reason to close access to Vehicle Assisted Recreation (VARA) people. This condition is strikingly similar to the Civil Rights situation of minorities in this country prior to 1964. These people were tolerated in public places and accommodations only so long as the politically correct group, the whites, did not object. Any time there was "user conflict", the minorities were relegated to the "back of the bus". Exactly the same prevails today in land use planning. As soon as a complaint is lodged against VARA activities the process to ban them begins. These people are accorded no rights and no respect. It time that these recreational racist policies be relegated to the trash bin of history, where they belong.
18	3	I	RECRE.500 00	610	Please seek to: - minimize conflict among users

152 35 RM PRCSS.1010 160
0

OHV use is every bit as legitimate a use of the public lands as non-motorized use. Although the current Forest Plan was formulated in the mid 1980's, motorized use is regulated relatively extensively. Non-mechanized use, on the other hand, is permitted anywhere and there appears to be very little authority to limit non-mechanized use except in isolated instances such as fencing off cultural sites, and a few other specialized instances, and in limiting group size. That means that if forced to eliminate user conflicts, as Wilderness Advocates often demand, the agencies only recourse would be to limit motorized use to a smaller area. The problem, however, is that conflicts between users is only one of three considerations which the agencies are charged with balancing in the EO's. The EO's set up three goals, all given equal weight, in directing land managers to regulate OHV use so as to "minimize" damage or conflicts; One is resource protection, one is safety of users and the third is minimizing conflicts among recreational users. Faced with this situation, and given the direction in the EO's and its regulations, what can an agency do to responsibly minimize user conflicts? The LAST thing it should do is to impose restrictions that further reduce the area where motorized use is permitted. To do so would force the growing OHV use into a smaller area, INCREASING the conflicts among users in those areas, including non-motorized and mechanized users, who would still be using these areas. This course of action would reduce the safety of all users, as that use would be concentrated in a smaller area and would certainly increase whatever impacts on resources there might be. All of these results would be a direct violation of the intent of the EO's, and certainly would not be proper resource management.

152 38 RM RECRE.501 610
00

While it may be true that vehicle-assisted visitors bother some non-motorized visitors, it is not true that these uses are mutually exclusive. In fact, I have personally found most non-motorized visitors to be perfectly happy to share. Additionally, I have been present in many instances where motorized visitors have offered assistance (sometimes life saving assistance) to non-motorized visitors. We find it very unfortunate that Wilderness Advocates seem to encourage and even teach an ethic of intolerance of certain public land visitors.

173	40	P	NRMGT.300 00	817	We visited the Fishlake NF on July 16, 17 and 18, 2004. During our time there we could hear ORVs much of the time during the day and into the evening. At times the noise was deceptive. The sound of the ORVs seemed to indicate they were approaching us. We would soon see the ORVs about 0.5 miles away. Eventually the sound receded as the ORVs traveled away from us. Groups passed us with as many as twelve ORVs. Occasionally we would be passed by ORVs coming from different directions only minutes apart.
152	41	RM	PRCSS.1010 0	610	Executive Orders 11644 and 11989 allow agencies to "minimize conflicts among the various uses". The Executive Orders did not state "minimize conflict with other users". Sadly, some implementation of Executive Orders 11644 and 11989 has been largely based on the incorrect interpretation to "minimize conflict with other users". The bottom line is that "use" conflict is rather different from "user" conflict. There are certainly "uses" that are incompatible from an objective standpoint. For example, a ski run and a mine cannot operate in the same place at the same time...it is physically impossible and therefore a clear "use conflict." However, in the case of a mine located next to a ski hill, both can operate without a use conflict.

Public Concern Number 404

Public Concern Order 32

Public Concern The Forest Service should create more loop routes: a) to improve motorized recreation opportunities, b) to protect natural resources, c) for public safety.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
74	1	I	TRANS.4080 0	620	We live at the end of side trail 76. Many, many people get to the end of the trail (at Dry Wash) and can't figure out how to get back to the Fremont Indian Museum area to their truck and trailer. No OHV's are allowed on Clear Creek Road through the state park. If the Forest service could grade a OHV road on the South side of Interstate 70 from the Indian Museum to Dry Wash, people could leave their vehicle at either end, ride all over the mountains in Kimberly, Sargent Mt., etc. and make a round trip. It would be a great day's ride. Now they either have to break the law to get back to the trailer, or go back over the mountains (several hours ride--sometimes in the dark).

96	1	I	TRANS.4000 0	620	I think you have gotten the right idea of making trails and loops so riders can return to trails with out backtracking.
48	3	I	TRANS.4000 0	690	I support responsible ATV access. If history and data are correct, our vision for the future needs to accommodate the larger and still growing number of ATVs. Loops that take the rider on an ever changing trail system seems to have little impact on the surrounding areas whereas dead-ended trails leave the rider wondering where they were supposed to go and they wander off the beaten path and give responsible riders a bad name.
131	5	I	TRANS.4080 0	623	Extend #74 to #22 to make a loop.
129	5	I	TRANS.4080 0	510	Trail #74 should be extended to trail #22 south of Joseph. Presently there is no outlet at the bottom of #74.
140	5	I	TRANS.4080 0	620	Trail #74 should be extended to trail #22 south of Joseph. Presently there is no outlet at the bottom of #74.
130	5	I	TRANS.4080 0	1	Trail #74 should be extended to Trail #22 south of Joseph. Presently there is no outlet at the bottom of #74.
124	5	I	TRANS.4080 0	811	Extend #74 to #22. I live in Marysville and have an RV park that depends on the Paiute ATV for our living.
128	5	I	TRANS.4080 0	1	Extend #74 to #22.
132	5	I	TRANS.4080 0	811	Extend #74 trail to connect to #22 in Sevier. I'm a senior citizen & riding ATV's is very important to me.
156	5	I	TRANS.4105 0	623	Special consideration should be given to short trail segments that provide loops for trail riding, Nothing is worse than traveling for miles only to find the upper section of a road or trail closed, prohibiting you from reaching the open trail section at the other end.
123	5	I	TRANS.4080 0	811	Extend 74 to 22. I have been riding the area for 9 years and love it and hope to keep riding this area for years t come.
126	5	I	TRANS.4080 0	811	Extend #74 to #22 in Sevier.
141	5	I	TRANS.4080 0	620	Trail #74 should be extended to trail #33 south of Joseph. Presently there is no outlet at the bottom of #74.
135	5	I	TRANS.4080 0	1	Extend #74 to #22 in Sevier.
110	6	I	TRANS.4082 0	610	Some type of loop around the bottom of Seven Mile to UM Creek next to the Johnson would make a lot of sense and keep people off 25.

110	7	I	RECRE.531 00	623	The plan has a lot of great access for OHV but very few loops so people don't have to back track or go cross country.
152	28	RM	TRANS.4000 0	623	7. General comments on OHV planning: g) The integrity of the "loop" trail system should be maintained. Loop systems minimize the number of on-trail encounters because non-motorized trail users don't encounter motorized users going both directions, as they do on non-loop trails. Loop trails also offer trail users a more desirable recreational experience. Agencies are encouraged to provide opportunity for "motorized loop trail systems" to lessen impacts and to provide a better recreational experience. Spurs are suitable for destination features such as scenic overlooks, campsites, viewing historic and cultural resources etc.

Public Concern Number 405

Public Concern Order 33

Public Concern The Forest Service should provide more motorized single track opportunities: a) to create unique recreational opportunities for motorcycles.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
153	6	RM	RECRE.501 00	620	We would also point out that there is no designated single track motorized trail in the system. Perhaps some of the rideable, proposed non-motorized portions could be designated as single track motorized
103	7	RM	TRANS.4105 2	1	In accordance with these principles (of the "American Public Lands Equal Access Protocol") the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project must implement the following:1. All single-track trails allowing bicycles must be open to motorcycles.
153	19	RM	TRANS.4105 2	625	Fillmore District South - Meadow Canyon Trail - This would be a great single track
152	27	RM	RECRE.531 10	625	7. General comments on OHV planning: e) Motorcycle trail riders enjoy riding single-track trails. Motorized single-track recreation trails are limited at this time and continue to decline. Some FS and FS districts do not differentiate between ATV and motorcycle trails in their travel plans. Evaluations and travel plans should differentiate between ATV and motorcycle trails. f) Single-track trails that are not appropriate for ATV use should be kept open for motorcycle use.

Public Concern Number 501

Public Concern Order 34

Public Concern *The Forest Service should make a travel plan with a map and rules that are easy to understand: a) to improve public understanding and adherence to the motorized travel plan, b) public service.*

Issue Number

Ltr#	Cmnt#	OrgType	Action	Rationale	Comment
49	1	I	ALTER.2000 0	1	I completely agree with the stated Purpose and Need for the project.
49	2	I	PRCSS.1210 0	1	I completely agree with the need to make the travel status (open or closed) more clearly understandable by the public.

Public Concern Number 502

Public Concern Order 35

Public Concern *The Forest Service should make a travel plan with a map and rules that are consistent with route designations and land management objectives on adjacent lands: a) to improve public understanding and adherence to the motorized travel plan, b) to reduce or eliminate management conflicts on National Forest and adjacent lands.*

Issue Number

Ltr#	Cmnt#	OrgType	Action	Rationale	Comment
36	1	I	TRANS.4000 0	25	Polk Creek route leading to Capitol Reef from Bullberry Spring will need to be reevaluated - consistent decision with NFS concerns.
156	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	There are a number of trails immediately west of Otter Creek State Park which were developed mostly due to the efforts of the previous Park Manager, Drew Kreitzer. Those have been popular trails and have been used by many local people as well as visitors to the nearby State Park. They were originally developed to provide ATV access to the mountains from the State Park. Generally speaking, it appears that most if not all of those trails are not proposed for closure. Those being relatively new and well used and accepted, I am wondering why the closure is being proposed. They being relatively new, considerations such as wildlife, fragile soils, seasonal closures, etc. would certainly have been considered before the trails were constructed. I think at least some of those should remain open.

155	2	F	RECRE.531 20	200	We support the proposed over snow vehicle closure west of the shared boundary between the Fishlake National Forest and Capitol Reef National Park. Capitol Reef does not allow snowmobiles within the park and this Forest Service management action would help prevent illegal entry.
155	3	F	ALTER.2310 0	200	We would recommend analyzing an alternative that extends the closure northward along the entire length of the shared boundary between the forest the park. Although most years might not have enough snow in the northern area for snowmobiles, there have been years when snow depth was sufficient to allow them to enter the park. Additionally, the western boundary of the snowmobile closure area does not appear to be defined by any particular feature on the ground. When snowmobilers are traveling in this area, it will be difficult, if not impossible, for them to determine where the closure boundary is located. We would recommend- using -something identifiable (like a road or topographic feature) to delineate this boundary.

Public Concern Number 503

Public Concern Order 36

Public Concern The Forest Service should prohibit unrestricted motorized cross-country travel on the Fishlake National Forest: a) to protect soils, b) to protect watersheds, c) to protect wildlife, d) to protect sensitive, threatened, and endangered plant and animal species, e) to protect roadless areas and potential wilderness, f) for public safety.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
-50	1	I	TRANS.4030 0	2	I understand that the Fishlake National Forest is creating an official travel plan that could have significant ramifications for motorized and non-motorized recreation, as well as wildlife habitat, clean water, and healthy ecosystems throughout the forest. I am pleased that the Forest Service is proposing to prohibit cross-country motorized travel, requiring vehicles to stay on designated routes and trails. This is a huge step in the right direction.
106	1	I	TRANS.4030 0	301	Bar cross-country travel. The proposed plan wisely prohibits the use of OHVs off the existing travel routes designated for their use. The time is long past when we could afford to let vehicles be driven all over the national forest lands, leaving erosion and beaten-down vegetation behind. Please include details on how this policy will be enforced.

108	1	I	TRANS.4030 0	1	I am writing to applaud your proposal to prohibit cross-country motorized travel, requiring vehicles to stay on designated routes and trails. Thanks, this is the minimum we need. I request that you require all ORVS, all vehicles, to stay on signed and designated main routes, not spurs or self-made trails.
50	1	I	TRANS.4030 0	2	As a native Utahan, I am writing you with concerns about the Fish Lake National Forest OHV travel plan. I would like to see the plan be as balanced as possible. Federal regulations stipulate that the Forest Service minimize conflict among users; locate ORV trails to minimize damage to soils, watersheds, and vegetation; and locate ORV trails to minimize harassment to wildlife. As a Jeep user myself, I have a stake in where I can and cannot drive. But ultimately my concern is what is best for the land: we do not need to be able to drive everywhere. I believe cross-country travel should be prohibited. There should be designated routes and trails. What is at risk is everything people go to nature for: wildlife, clear water, healthy ecosystems throughout the forests.
175	1	I	TRANS.4030 0	1	I'm glad to read that the Forest Service is proposing to prohibit cross-country motorized travel in the Fishlake National Forest and will require vehicles to stay on designated routes and trails.
166	2	F	TRANS.4030 0	300	This Project has the potential to greatly improve conditions of sensitive resources and user-experiences in the Forest. We appreciate the policy shift that enforces OHV recreation to travel ways and areas designated as open to motorized use only, and we fully support closing and maintaining excess, redundant and damaging roads and trails.
22	2	I	TRANS.4030 0	1	I understand that your travel plan will likely eliminate cross-country travel in all sectors. That's certainly a step in the right direction, but it's like saying you'll fix the latch on the barn door after all the horses
104	3	I	TRANS.4000 0	1	The Forest Service should develop a plan to further limit their access to remote areas and currently open areas of the forest.
-16	3	I	TRANS.4030 0	1	I strongly support and applaud the proposal to prohibit cross-country motorized travel, thus requiring vehicles to stay on designated routes and trails. This is a huge step in the right direction.

46	4	P	TRANS.4030 0	300	Since coming national policy closes forests to cross country travel, the Fishlake's cross-country closure is NOT a significant "victory". The base map neglects opportunities for large, unbroken areas for non-motorized recreation and unfragmented wildlife habitat.
156	6	I	TRANS.4030 0	510	I pretty much agree with minimizing cross country travel. Although there may be some places where it may still be appropriate, I think generally speaking, that there are plenty of established trails to ride and not much sense in forming new user made trails that will almost certainly come into question some day.
63	6	I	TRANS.4030 0	300	I believe American society has come to a majority consensus that off-trail riding (creation of informal trails and roads by individuals) is completely inappropriate and must be illegal. Therefore, I am relieved and will be a strong supporter of your decision to prohibit cross-country travel. Prohibition of cross-country travel is absolutely required to ensure that our National Forest lands are not trashed - rutted, torn up and damaged regardless of the biological sensitivity of any given location.
63	11	I	NRMGT.302 00	300	The Fishlake has suffered (as many of our National Forests) an appalling amount of damage caused by irresponsible OHV users. Though a few bad apples may be at fault, because of the impossibility of distinguishing the bad ones, all OHV users will end up suffering due to tougher rules and restrictions. We cannot allow the continued destruction of important wildlife habitat and forest resources by OHV users who illegally go off-road and create new informal trails and roads. Once made, other users will soon follow; soon a deeply rutted and eroded trail will exist, and much worse, it will provide access to yet more sensitive lands. The erosion will degrade the streams and invasive weeds will occur where seeds from an affected area are transported by the OHV into a virgin biological area. Many species are highly sensitive to disturbances. Rehabilitation of informal and illegal OHV trails will reconnect habitats and lock out the disturbance of noisy OHV traffic. Therefore, first the Fishlake Travel Plan must stop additional damage, then enforce the rules, and finally, it must reclaim the damaged lands through restoration
65	22	I	RECRE.531 00	610	How do "networks of user-developed routes" create user conflicts? "Problems do not occur equally throughout the Forest." If problems are not forest-wide, why is the ban on OHV's forest-wide? Why not ban OHV's in only the problem areas?

65	24	I	TRANS.4050 0	811	As quoted from the Proposed Action paragraph and the above FAQ: "The major motorized impacts are occurring during hunting season and spring antler shed gathering, in play areas next to communities, and around popular dispersed camping areas." Why is the USDA-FS imposing a ban on all OHV cross country travel ALL year, if the major impacts are occurring seasonally. The ban should be seasonal, coinciding with the time of the year that the major impacts are occurring. To do so otherwise would be discriminating against OHV travel in favor of other modes of travel.
65	26	I	TRANS.4031 0	819	I do agree restricting OHV travel around and in popular dispersed camping areas to direct access to the camp site is a very reasonable action, not only from an environmental point of view but from a
65	30	I	TRANS.4050 0	1	If "Some of the most notable off road impacts on he Fishlake occur during hunting season", then why must the Fishlake be closed to cross country travel by OHV all year?
65	31	I	NRMGT.302 00	1	"There is no consistent, logical or enforceable means to assure" that ANY mode of travel will not cause an impact on the environment. Using this excuse refers to ALL modes of travel, not just OHV's.
173	84	P	TRANS.4030 0	340	Attachment photo 6: UTM 411075 4257541Photo 1164. Box Creek. The proposed route ends up slope. This area is fenced. The fence descends a steep slope to enclose this area. It appears to be an access point for cattle to Box Creek. The steep slope may deter some ATV users from descending to the creek, but one or two riders could cause significant damage to this stream small wet meadow.
173	85	P	TRANS.4030 0	2	Attachment photo 7: UTM 411075 4257541Photo 1165. Looking up slope from Box Creek. This is an extension beyond the proposed transportation system addition, it is steep, rocky, and eroding into Box Creek. This area creates a real safety hazard if ATV users decide to explore beyond the end of the proposed route. The proposed route creates a management and monitoring problem.

Public Concern Number 504

Public Concern Order 37

Public Concern *The Forest Service should designate additional play areas next to communities: a) to provide motorized recreational opportunities.*

Issue Number

Ltr#	Cmnt#	OrgType	Action	Rationale	Comment
137	1	I	TRANS.4032 0	621	I think a great asset for the Marysvale area would be an OHV management use area west of Marysvale off both sides of trail.
129	1	I	TRANS.4032 0	621	Given the numbers of riders in the Marysvale area comparative to the Richfield area, some consideration should be given to an OHV open riding area near Marysvale like the one west of Richfield.
130	1	I	TRANS.4032 0	621	Given the numbers of riders in the Marysvale area comparative to the Richfield area, some consideration should be given to an OHV open riding area near Marysvale like the one west of Richfield.
140	1	I	TRANS.4032 0	621	Given the numbers of riders in the Marysvale area comparative to the Richfield area, some consideration should be given to an OHV open riding area near Marysvale like the one west of Richfield.
141	1	I	TRANS.4032 0	621	Given the numbers of riders in the Marysvale area comparative to the Richfield area, some consideration should be given to an OHV open riding area near Marysvale like the one west of Richfield.
136	1	I	TRANS.4032 0	621	I feel that there is a great need for an OHV management use area west of Marysvale off both sides of trail #77 section 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, & 27 on BLM & forest service.
131	2	I	TRANS.4032 0	621	Make OHV management area west of Marysvale - great for all riders to play.
124	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	915	There is a great need for a OHV management use area west of Marysvale on both sides of 77 trail.
126	2	I	TRANS.4032 0	620	There is a need for OHV management use area west of Marysvale on both sides of trail #77.
127	3	I	TRANS.4032 0	620	Marysvale has so many riders there need to be an OHV management area for them to enjoy.
128	3	I	TRANS.4032 0	1	We would like to see an open ATV area west of Marysvale like Richfield has.
125	3	I	TRANS.4032 0	620	There needs to be an open area west of Marysvale like Richfield has for kids & adults to play.

134	3	I	TRANS.4032 0	621	Make OHV management area for riders such as Richfield has west of Marysville.
132	3	I	TRANS.4032 0	621	There is a need for management use area West of Marysville - (like the one in the Richfield area).
135	3	I	TRANS.4032 0	621	With the great amount of riders in the Marysville area, an OHV management use area west of Marysville off both sides of trail #77 section 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 on BLM & Forest Service.
123	4	I	TRANS.4032 0	620	There is a need for an open riding area near Marysville, probably more riders in Marysville than Richfield.
138	4	I	TRANS.4032 0	621	Make an OHV management use area west of Marysville like the one in Richfield. A lot of riders in this area would use this.
197	5	C	TRANS.4032 1	621	The commission contends the Velvet Ridge Play Area is far too small. Enlarge this area, even to include the entire Velvet Ridge. The issue of and need for "play areas" and cross country open areas is one the Commission is extremely concerned about. The Commission agrees that more and larger of these types of areas are necessary in order to properly accommodate this legitimate use. The Velvet Ridge is a good place for this activity, though the current size is not adequate. The county is currently working with the BLM in planning "play areas" on BLM lands in the county. We would be pleased to meet with you and further discuss the Velvet Ridge, the appropriate size and the resulting management.

Public Concern Number 505

Public Concern Order 39

Public Concern The Forest Service should allow motorized cross-country travel for game retrieval: a) to allow elderly and disabled greater hunting opportunities, b) to avoid the wasting of game meat, c) to improve public compliance with the travel plan.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

158	1	I	TRANS.4031 0	650	<p>First, I am 70 years young and I find the scenery and serenity of being able to get away on my ATV exhilarating and renewing. Staying on the trail is important and protects both the environment and me as long as the trail is available to use. I am still able to hunt because I can use my ATV but find the proposed rule of not letting you recover your game by a one time incursion off the trail quite burdensome and making it very difficult to retrieve your game. I really do not see how any damage could occur.</p>
7	1	I	TRANS.4031 0	650	<p>Comment - Jody Gale - Utah State Extension Service - he expressed this comment as both a professional and a private citizen who is a bow hunter. He is very concerned that we may not allow cross country travel for game retrieval. While he understands that we must restrict cross country travel, he predicts that the resource may be lost due to spoilage because the game wasn't able to be placed in a cooler in a timely manner after it was harvested. He further suggested that some hunters may take only a portion of the resource, leaving the rest of the meat and the carcass to rot on site. He would therefore strongly urge the forest to consider allowing cross country travel for the purpose of preserving the resource, while ensuring restrictions are in place to prevent abuse of the privilege.</p>
115	1	I	TRANS.4031 0	650	<p>Primary concern is loss of ability to go cross-country for game retrieval & feels that FS already has mind made up.1) He is disabled, but likes to hunt - animals shot don't always stay put he needs to be able to retrieve game.2) Suggested getting on agenda on a RAC meeting.</p>
72	2	I	TRANS.4031 0	1	<p>We need to make rules that you can enforce, I don't mind if someone goes and gets an elk with 4 wheeler but only one 4 wheeler if more they should be fined. I hope you look at what some of the other</p>
120	3	I	TRANS.4031 0	811	<p>My other point is that I am handicapped and unable to retrieve game without the aid of an ATV. You are making no allowance for handicapped and cutting off our access!</p>

101	5	I	TRANS.4031 0	650	An exemption I feel needs to be addressed is game retrieval. In your FAQ you imply that the damaged occurring during hunting season is directly due to game retrieval. This simply is not the truth. There is no data to my knowledge that supports that assumption. When looking at the annual harvest numbers of big game for this area, it is clear that the damage occurring is from other sources. Yes, there is a chance some damage can occur just as there is a chance for damage to take place with current travel routes. The damage during the hunting season comes from pursuit of game, scouting for game, and all the people that came along with the hunter which spend their time riding the OHVs anywhere they can.
101	6	I	NRMGT.302 00	2	The Mt Nebo range of the Uinta National Forest closed the area to open OHV use but left the game retrieval option in place. At first it was abused, but with very little enforcement and some advertisement of the fines given, almost all unauthorized use stopped. I personally seen ATVs that never left camp. With some education, enforcement, a little advertisement about the costs of breaking the rules, and time this option can work. It is easy to doubt the general public's ability to follow these guidelines, but give them the benefit of the doubt and a chance to prove you wrong.
101	7	I	TRANS.4031 0	650	I know some are saying "in the old days they had to haul every thing out on their back, why do they need an OHV now?". I have heard tells of some of those old-timers that left part of their game to rot because they could not retrieve it. And, if they had had an OHV you bet they would have used it. no one likes to see an animal
114	8	I	TRANS.4031 0	650	I would like to comment about the new proposal to not let us drive off the road to retrieve our game animals. This is going to waste game and is very discriminating to people like myself who can no longer carry or drag a deer or elk back to the road. This proposal should allow people to drive an ATV or pickup off the road or trail one time to retrieve a game animal. This would not cause any damage.
101	8	I	TRANS.4031 0	811	I do not own an OHV of any sort and last year I de-boned my deer and haul it out on my back. It took 7 hours. Someday my health may not allow me that option, them what?

151	8	I	NRMGT.302 00	650	I feel that the more existing roads and trails that are closed will result in some people just making new ones where they shouldn't, especially in the area of game retrieval. Existing roads could also be used for possible access to fire crews or search & rescue personnel as well as retrieving
65	33	I	TRANS.4031 0	2	The National OHV policy DISCRIMINATES against the disabled and the elderly. The disabled and the elderly NEED a means by which to retrieve game, to participate in activities the same as persons without a physical impairment or disability. By prohibiting the use of OHV's, disabled and the elderly are confined and restricted, physically, in where they can hunt. Thus, this policy DISCRIMINATES against the disabled and the elderly. This policy is like posting a sign that says "Wheelchairs are NOT allowed".
65	34	I	TRANS.4031 0	2	The antler shed policy DISCRIMINATES against the disabled and the elderly. The disabled and the elderly NEED a means by which to participate in activities the same as persons without a physical impairment or disability. By prohibiting the use of OHV's, disabled and the elderly are confined and restricted, physically, in where and in what they can do. Thus, this policy DISCRIMINATES against the disabled and the elderly. This policy is like posting a sign that says "Wheelchairs are NOT allowed".

Public Concern Number 506

Public Concern Order 40

Public Concern The Forest Service should prohibit motorized cross-country travel for game retrieval: a) to protect natural resources, b) to avoid enforcement problems.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
31	1	I	TRANS.4031 0	1	The forest should not allow retrieval of game.

43	5	I	TRANS.4031 0	2	There was a comment by a gray bearded gentleman in your Richfield public meeting. It was to allow hunters OHV access to retrieve their game. This was tried once before when the original plan was implemented. It did not work. The privilege was seriously abused and resulted in its termination. I believe you would have the same disregard now. I, therefore, recommend OHV use for game retrieval off designated routes not be allowed. If an individual plans on hunting - the possibility of success must enter his/her mind. They have the responsibility to become familiar with the travel plan and make provisions for any circumstance they encounter.
----	---	---	-----------------	---	--

Public Concern Number 507

Public Concern Order 41

Public Concern The Forest Service should increase seasonal restrictions: a) to protect wildlife habitats, b) to reduce road and trail maintenance needs.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
171	6	I	TRANS.4050 0	453	2. The Fishlake OHV Route Designation Situation. It is my contention that: c. That seasonal closures in areas where wildlife, particularly deer and elk, historically winter, breed and calve/fawn are inadequate in number and duration.
171	9	I	TRANS.4050 0	453	3. Proposed Solution. The following solutions are proposed: b. In conjunction with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, seasonally close all trails that historically traverse areas where deer and elk winter, breed, fawn and calve. Closure to be in effect for the duration of those

Public Concern Number 508

Public Concern Order 42

Public Concern The Forest Service should designate a system of roads and trails that are open to motorized travel: a) to improve public understanding and adherence to travel plan, b) to make the travel plan easier to enforce, c) to meet the requirements of the National OHV rule, d) to protect natural resources.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
75	1	I	ALTER.2352 0	1	I support the Fishlake's Proposed Action.

86	1	RM	ALTER.2352 0	1	I just wanted to send a quick note all the way from Houston, TX to say that I have heard of your proposed Action Plan and that I fully support it.
56	1	I	TRANS.4020 0	2	I think it's important to make official trails and prohibit ORV use on non-legitimate trails but I would really hope that you don't take proposed trails into wild areas that are not already being used by ORV users. I think it's as important, if not more important, to protect Utah's wildlife and watershed areas as it is to create legal
90	1	I	ALTER.2352 0	1	Please continue with your proposed action. I think it is good.
92	1	I	ALTER.2352 0	1	I support the Fishlake Proposed Action.
43	1	I	TRANS.4010 0	1	I support the specified route designation for Salina Canyon so long as they are unchanged from the previous travel plan. For sure, the White Mountain area should remain closed to all motorized vehicles.
82	1	I	ALTER.2352 0	1	I support the proposed action.
93	1	I	ALTER.2352 0	620	The Fishlake National Forest is well ahead of the curve in proper planning for OHV use on the forest. I support the designation of roads and trails in sufficient quantity, and diversity to support and properly disperse the existing and potential OHV use that occurs there. The PROPOSED ACTION come closest in proper planning for this use. Designated trail systems such as the Piute and Great Western are some of the best examples of how to properly manage OHV use.
101	1	I	TRANS.4000 0	300	I would like to say that as a whole the limiting of OHV use to existing roads and trails is needed. It is clear that with the current increase in such uses that the land was being damaged.
94	1	I	ALTER.2352 0	1	Just a quick note to let you know that I support the proposed action.
83	1	I	ALTER.2352 0	1	We support the proposed Fishlake Travel Plan keeping the OHV trails open to our
152	1	RM	ALTER.2352 0	620	In general, Blue Ribbon Coalition (BRC) supports the Proposed Action. Well, I guess we have to admit that the Proposed Action was, indeed, "pretty well thought out". As such, the Proposed Action is an excellent beginning. BRC commends the planning staff for being open and willing to meet and discuss issues, provide additional information and maps.
80	1	I	ALTER.2352 0	1	I am in support of the proposed action.

47	3	I	TRANS.4030 0	300	Prohibition on Cross-Country: We commend the Forest Service for proposing to bar OHVs from driving off designated routes. That is basic to protecting the land and resources.
30	4	I	TRANS.4030 0	1	I want people to stay on existing trails and roads. I do not like people cutting new trails wherever they want to.
180	5	I	TRANS.4030 0	620	I agree with no "Cross-Country" travel except on sand dunes. I think designated roads and trails especially designed for ATV travel should be allowed.

Public Concern Number 509

Public Concern Order 43

Public Concern The Forest Service should increase the number and miles of roads and trails that are open to motorized recreation: a) to address future growth in motorized use, b) to reduce use conflicts, c) to reduce environmental effects, d) for public safety, e) to provide for desired motorized recreation opportunities.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
72	1	I	TRANS.4082 0	1	I would like to see a trail from Salina Creek to Acord Lake area, the other trails are enough for me, we need to give the elk and deer enough room.
157	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	810	Concerning the Fishlake and all the trails in the Richfield area, all the trails should be left open and even more made for the ATV riders. We stay on the trails and try to obey the laws'. but sometimes its hard when we see our rights being taken away from us by the closing of the trails for a few people with more money than us.
196	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	2	I am writing this letter as a member of the Southern Utah OHV Club, supporting their efforts to keep OHV trails open to the public. My wife Alice and I attended the ATV Jamboree at Richfield in 2000. I attended again with a friend in 2002. This is a world class event with attendees from many foreign countries. The year 200 had over 800 ATV units in the parade, and in the year 2002 there were in excess of 500 riders in the different rides. With this many riders entered it is imperative that they be dispersed as much as possible for rider safety, protecting the environment and allowing the riders a diversity of the scenic beauty available and to ride on trails that are not beyond their skill levels.
187	1	I	TRANS.4080 0	1	Need to have a route from Accord Lakes to Salina Creek Road.

13	2	I	RECRE.531 00	690	2. The number of motorized users of public lands will continue to increase as our population increases. Please plan accordingly by developing additional motorized trail opportunities in areas where motorized recreation can be properly managed.
48	2	I	TRANS.4020 0	1	There are some questionable trails that have been user created. I would also like to support a study that would move those trails into part of the proposed travel plan.
110	3	I	TRANS.4082 0	1	The new Gooseberry Road needs some type of OHV trail next to it or a new trail.
38	3	I	RECRE.501 00	620	You get more use from OHV on mountain per day use than any other use. It should be expanded not limited.
193	4	I	TRANS.4105 0	300	Many people I have talked to about the Forest Service's proposed plan feel that there will be more damage done to the environment by concentrating all the OHV travel on a few trails, than by letting them spread out over many trails. There is also the safety factor to consider. The more the riders are concentrated the more danger there is. It is my suggestion to leave most of the trails that are being used now by OHV riders open, but make it a very serious offense to create new trails.
197	9	C	TRANS.4105 0	690	Finally, the Commission is opposed to continually restricting access. There is a concern that as the legitimate use of public lands by OHVs increases that access and associated routes will be capped at a "2004 level," while ATVs will continue to increase in sales and use. The Commission desires to see a well-developed plan for the future that takes into account this continually increasing form of recreation. The Commission is not convinced that restricting and even decreasing access, essentially confining more & more users to the same limited areas and trails, is the prudent way to proceed, particularly for the long-term.
103	9	RM	TRANS.4080 0	690	In accordance with these principles (of the "American Public Lands Equal Access Protocol") the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project must implement the following:3. Due to increasing demand as mentioned in the planning document, additional motorized single track trails and roads should be constructed, especially to close loops and prove access to scenic destinations.

103	10	RM	TRANS.4000 0	1	In accordance with these principles (of the "American Public Lands Equal Access Protocol") the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project must implement the following:4. All roads being used by full size vehicles should be designated and new recreational roads constructed.
-----	----	----	-----------------	---	---

Public Concern Number 510

Public Concern Order 44

Public Concern The Forest Service should decrease the number and miles of roads and trails that are open to motorized recreation: a) to address future growth in motorized use, b) to reduce use conflicts, c) to protect natural resources, d) for public safety, e) to provide for desired non-motorized recreation opportunities, f) to reduce route maintenance needs.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
104	1	I	TRANS.4110 0	1	I agree with the proposed plan to limit OHV travel on the Fishlake National Forest by closing several trails.
161	1	P	TRANS.4030 0	300	Closing the forest to cross-country travel is a positive step in line with national policy and sound and enforceable land management practice. The Fishlake is to be commended for taking the initiative to deal with travel issues before issuance of the revised LRMP. The proposal as it is currently presented, however, is very troubling from a conservation perspective. The proposed action seems to recommend just about every route on the forest that exists now or existed in the past be designated "open" to motorized travel. In my wide experience with on the ground conditions on the Fishlake, I am greatly concerned that inadequate research has led to a proposed transportation system that will do little to alleviate current problems, and may lead to additional ORV management problems in the future.
17	1	I	TRANS.4080 0	819	It is time to stop the imposition of motorized routes, since Americans sitting on their motorized seats are getting fatter and fatter. It is time to make Americans walk to fight obesity. I see absolutely no reason in today's obese America, that any new roads should be cut for people to sit more. Don't you read the papers on the health threat of obesity with people reaching 10000lbs and more.
73	2	I	TRANS.4110 0	1	I support the local Ranger Dayle Flanigan's proposed closing of approximately 82 miles of trails, roads and logging roads.

58	2	I	TRANS.4110 0	300	Find ways to close off areas where there is damage and let the healing begin. Like any motorized vehicle, the OHVs need to be managed, licensed, and kept on stable surfaces.
46	2	P	TRANS.4110 0	935	With the existing maintenance backlog, the total number of open routes must drop significantly lower than the existing
49	5	I	TRANS.4110 0	1	"Roads to nowhere" should be obliterated.
98	5	I	NRMGT.302 00	1	Adding additional roads/routes will exacerbate the problems caused by this use/abuse, and increase the need for law enforcement.
46	5	P	TRANS.4110 0	300	If routes are not apparent on the ground, _____ re-vegetated or motorized use no longer occurs. There is no reason to label these routes as "open" on a map. Why degrade areas that are recovering? Resource damaging routes should not remain open.
49	7	I	TRANS.4070 0	515	2,500 miles of routes seems like a lot. What sort of route density does this represent? Generally accepted maximum route densities range from 1.5 to 2 miles per square mile.
63	7	I	TRANS.4105 0	300	My greatest complaint with the Forest Service's current proposal is with regard to which routes will be designated as open to motorized travel (including OHV use). The current proposals simply leave far too many miles of routes open. If all these existing trails are designated as open routes, then all the illegitimate user-created trails, created without regard to effects on natural resources, wilderness, or wildlife habitat will remain no matter their negative impacts. This will allow motorized routes to continue their advancing encroachment into roadless areas, important wildlife habitat, and other sensitive areas.
171	8	I	TRANS.4110 0	1	3. Proposed Solution. The following solutions are proposed: a. From the existing Fishlake Travel Map consider only those routes bearing a Forest Route of Trail designation. Permanently close all others.
49	8	I	TRANS.4110 0	1	All routes not included as classified should not simply be closed, but rather obliterated.
46	8	P	TRANS.4110 0	510	Any route designed for a specific purpose (timber sales, chaining, terracing) should be closed, recontoured and revegetated where the route is no longer needed for the purpose for which it was designed.

108	9	I	TRANS.4000 0	2	I would like to see you:- locate ORV trails to minimized damage to soils, watersheds, and vegetation, while ORV use is phased out.- locate ORV trails to minimize harassment to wildlife while ORV use is
173	27	P	TRANS.4110 0	165	The Forest Service must identify all unneeded roads that should be decommissioned or considered for other uses, such as hiking trails. 36 C.F.R. ? 215.5(b)(2). As required by the regulations, "Forest officials should give priority to decommissioning those unneeded roads that pose the greatest risk to public safety or to environmental degradation." Id.

Public Concern Number 511

Public Concern Order 45

Public Concern The Forest Service should have and provide good rationale for closing roads and trails to motorized use: a) to give the public a chance to influence the decision, b) to gain public understanding and acceptance, c) to maintain motorized recreation opportunities.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
153	-7	RM	RECRE.501 00	620	We would again just caution you to have a very valid reason to close off any trail.
153	5	RM	NRMGT.301 00	510	The more we look at your current proposal, the more trails we find that are either closed to motorized travel or are just not on the map. Many trails look to be closed for no real reason. We would like to visit those trails and see if we can determine a valid reason to close them. Unfortunately, no one person in our club is familiar with all of the forest, so it's going to take some time to organize and evaluate.

Public Concern Number 512

Public Concern Order 46

Public Concern The Forest Service should have and provide good rationale for making or keeping roads and trails open to motorized use: a) to give the public a chance to influence the decision, b) to gain public understanding and acceptance, c) to comply with Executive Orders 11644 and 11989, 36CFR295 and other regulations, d) to protect natural resources, e) to create a minimal and/or optimal motorized transportation network.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
-------------	--------------	----------------	---------------	------------------	----------------

70	1	I	PRCSS.1210 0	1	<p>1) If all roads and trails identified as "Open Seasonally", or "Open Yearly," have been through a process that would give them legitimate status as a Forest Service Road or Trail? In other words are these entries authorized, classified and inventoried? or</p> <p>2) Do certain of these road and trails represent "unplanned or user-created" routes and, therefore their authorization, classification and inventory status is in question?</p> <p>3) Among the criteria employed for annotating a trail upon your "Proposed Motorized Travel Plan" was the following considered in each case:</p> <p>a) Damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, and other forest resources?</p> <p>b) Harassment of wildlife and significant disruption of wildlife habitats?</p> <p>c) Conflicts between motor vehicle use and existing or proposed recreational use?</p> <p>d) Consistency with Fishlake trail management objectives?</p>
49	4	I	TRANS.4070 0	1	<p>When considering which routes to include in the classified travel network, each route should be judged as to whether it contributes to the access of some</p>
161	4	P	TRANS.4070 0	300	<p>The following is an illustration of twenty locations on the Fishlake with photographs and maps. These locations represent specific routes and their shortcomings, and should be applied as examples of how to avoid poor route designation decisions forest-wide. This is by no means a comprehensive list of UFN's concerns with the proposal, but is meant to illustrate general problems that occur forest wide. While the fast track approach has its place, it is imperative that further study be given to the true legitimacy of the routes proposed for designation as "open". A simple set of GPS coordinates is not enough to justify the designation of a route.</p> <p>Photographs and context of the area served and damage occurring should also be part of management consideration. Many routes proposed as "open" are unused, re-vegetated, should have been decommissioned in compliance with NFMA, or have been created by users with no attention paid to sensitive environments. Many routes serve no purpose, have no definable destination, and are duplicitous. It is essential to maintenance of ecological integrity to begin the process with a blank map, adding truly necessary routes, instead of starting with a map of every known route on the forest, then eliminating a very small percentage of those routes.</p>

98	10	I	TRANS.4110 0	340	Many of these routes have definite impacts in aquatic habitat and riparian areas; areas that should certainly be excluded from any type of motorized impact. Again, why are these being considered without the proper environmental safeguards being put in place? Many of the roads/routes are nothing more than redundant routes to places already accessed by classified roads, others are simply "driveways" into a dispersed campsite; these should not be part of the system. It is obvious that the Forest has not done any of the appropriate groundwork for these routes; if it had, these glaring impacts would have been noted (and the routes eliminated from consideration).
173	41	P	NRMGT.301 00	510	During June, 2004, meetings with the Fishlake National Forest Red Rock Forests and other members of the Three Forests were given the impression that the routes identified for classification had been located with a GPS. Some notes were taken but not photographs. The Fishlake NF did not indicate whether the fieldworkers were given any criteria for examining routes and making a recommendation for inclusion or exclusion from classification. We did not ask if such instructions were given. Now that we have seen the types of routes proposed for classification we would like to see whatever instructions were given to those surveying the routes. We need to know if any specific protocol was used to determine which routes would be recommended as additions to the transportation system.
173	42	P	NRMGT.301 00	820	The selection of roads and motorized trails to include on the classified transportation system appears random. No consideration of the nature, purpose, or lack of purpose of the route seems to have been taken into account by the person conducting the fieldwork. Aside from the findings listed above, we found some routes were signed closed by the Fishlake NF. One proposed route was signed closed and invited foot traffic only. Some routes could not be accessed because of private property. If the extent of analysis of routes consisted of tracing them with a GPS then the level of analysis is totally inadequate for the purposes of NEPA and NFMA. Any decision based on such an inventory technique would necessarily result in an arbitrary and capricious decision since adequate information is not available to make an informed decision.

173 45 P TRANS.4070 160
0

Each proposed route must be analyzed with specific criteria. See the discussion of EO 11644 and 36 CFR ?? 212 & 295, above. The routes proposed for addition to the system of classified routes are not routes approved by the Fishlake NF through a NEPA process. They have not been analyzed to make sure they meet the legal requirements of 36 CFR 212, 295 and other regulations. The Fishlake NF cannot presume that unclassified routes meet the requirements of classified routes suitable for motorized access by the general public. Our experience clearly shows that no discretion or thought went into which routes are proposed for addition to the classified road and trail system. We have reviewed the photographs submitted by Tim Peterson with the Utah Forest Network. The photographs depict the same problems we encountered: revegetated routes with no evidence of use or apparent public need for use; dead end routes with no evident public purpose; poorly constructed or user created routes showing erosion and soil compaction; off route ATV use; unnecessary degradation to riparian zones and streams; multiple braided routes through meadows and streams; rutting routes; steep routes descending directly down hill; routes that were not designed or constructed to prevent resource damage; and redundant routes which do not enhance recreational opportunity.

Public Concern Number 513

Public Concern Order 47

Public Concern The Forest Service should leave all existing roads and trails currently used by motorized users open: a) because the use is established, b) to meet current and future demands for motorized recreation, c) because they have minimal resource impacts.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
71	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	600	I am formally asking that no trails be closed and that all existing trails remain open. This Fishlake forest has many good viable trail systems that are well maintained, marked and used frequently.

154	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	811	Recently I was talking to my neighbor and he told me of some of the new proposals on ORV Routes and ATV use. We discussed some good and bad points. I'm not one that keeps up on everything and probably should more than I do. But this is one thing I do want to be part of I grew up in these mountains, as have many people, hunting, fishing, hiking and horseback riding. I remember driving up and down roads with my mother on back of our 3 wheeled tote goats. How she ever survived all those trips and endless hours I'll never know. I also remember hunting with my dad on roads that are not in use anymore, they were great hunting areas. Most of them were used by his dad by horse and wagon. When they were closed they said they were being closed because they were of no use or they weren't at least 50 years old. We'll my friend they were being used and they were older than 50 years old. But I got over the closures. I try to hike some of them at least once or twice a year just for the memories. I am getting older in age and in not many more years I won't be able to hike them. The same is true with the OHV trails. I want them left open. The land is there for our use, not for someone like Bill Clinton to have his name put on it to close it down.
81	1	I	ALTER.2351 0	620	I strongly support leaving the Fish Lake OHV management plan, "as is". The Forest Service has done a great job at developing an OHV management model that is envied nationwide
5	1	I	TRANS.4000 0	811	We don't want our riding to go away in your area. Love it too much.
48	1	I	TRANS.4000 0	1	I support the existing roads and trails that provide motorized vehicle access.
144	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	811	Leave the roads and trails alone! They were being used long before I walked the earth and should be here OPEN to be used by those who come long after I'm six feet
60	1	I	TRANS.4105 1	920	Roads are what made America great -- why close them? Roads/transportation bring products to market and allow access. Working folks need them - logging/minerals/livestock.
143	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	811	Leave the roads and trails open. Don't close any of them. I am to damn old to walk or crawl!
62	1	I	TRANS.4105 1	920	Roads are what made America great -- why close them? Roads/transportation bring products to market and allow access. Working folks need them - logging/minerals/livestock.

160	2	I	TRANS.4000 0	840	We have noticed that the other regions have increased trails for ATV use; such as the Fillmore and Loa, while the Beaver region is decreasing roads and trails.
-188	3	I	TRANS.4105 0	510	It greatly concerns us that where there are roads or trails on the forest lands that have been used by the people for years and years, but for some reason have not been put on forest maps, are now scheduled to be closed. We would ask that you reconsider this action. Where they are roads that are old existing roads or trails, they should remain open, not closed just because they might not show on your
153	3	RM	TRANS.4105 0	2	We would like you to strongly consider keeping all of the existing routes that are being used presently open to motorized travel. We are not opposed to closing a trail if there is an obvious reason to do so, not just "it doesn't need to be there". We would like to remind you that the club is available to help you maintain or repair any problem areas as well. Think of the thousands of man hours it has taken you to put this all together. We feel we should be given more time to evaluate this very important proposal.
100	3	I	ALTER.2352 0	130	Eliminating these added routes from the Alt 2 proposal based on specific public complaints is backwards; shouldn't you be only adding routes to the current Travel Plan that the Forest Service specifically finds a need for and that the Forest Service has physically surveyed, and gone through all the legal requirements?
30	3	I	TRANS.4105 0	1	I want all the roads and trails open to 4 wheel ATV use as possible.
14	3	I	TRANS.4000 0	400	Leave all open roads, routes alone and close only those that may be needed for habitat or wildlife management. I do own a ATV but mostly hunt in the fall in a jeep and are appalled that roads I have been on in my jeep are now closed except to ATVs.
160	4	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	We feel that this is an exorbitant proposal to decrease trails that have been available for several years. We are not asking for more trails, our only desire is to maintain areas and trails that have been available for numerous years.
133	4	I	RECRE.531 00	811	We come to the Marysville area from Georgia each year to ride ATV's. PLEASE do not close trails that make this so enjoyable.
127	4	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	We have enjoyed riding in this area for fourteen years, and we really hate to see any of the trails closed. Please keep them

139	4	I	RECRE.531 00	811	We come to the Marysville area from Georgia each year to ride ATV's and enjoy this spectacular area. Please do not close trails that make this so enjoyable!
107	5	I	TRANS.4105 0	1	It greatly concerns us that where there are roads or trails on the forest lands that have been used by the people for years and years, but for some reason have not been put on forest maps, are now scheduled to be closed. We would ask that you reconsider this action. Where they are roads that are old existing roads or trails, they should remain open, not closed just because they might not show on your
186	7	I	TRANS.4105 0	811	My family consists of my wife and I eight children and four spouses. I have conferred with numerous other people who feel these trails should be left open. I hope this letter will influence you to keep the
103	8	RM	TRANS.4105 0	1	In accordance with these principles (of the "American Public Lands Equal Access Protocol") the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project must implement the following:2. All existing routes used by ATV's must be designated open.
160	8	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	We the people of Beaver are not asking for great changes, we only want what has been in existence to be remain and be
103	11	RM	TRANS.4105 0	134	In accordance with these principles (of the "American Public Lands Equal Access Protocol") the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project must implement the following:5. All roads that could be asserted under RS2477 must be designated

152	15	RM	TRANS.4105 0	870	2. Comment: When developing management alternatives the FS must recognize the public's desire to keep existing opportunities open. OHV's are by far the most desired and utilized means to obtain solitude in nature. A poll conducted in April, 2000 by Public Opinion Strategies, Inc. (POSI), a nationally respected polling firm located in Alexandria, Virginia, found that nearly two-thirds of Utahans use public lands for recreation either "a lot" (27%) or "some" (38%). Only 13% of Utahans said they never recreated on public lands. An overwhelming eighty-six per cent (86%) of Utahans said they used motorized vehicles to travel to Utah's federal lands or when they use the lands for recreation. Of the eighty-six per cent, two-thirds said they utilized a truck or four-wheel drive. In response to the POSI poll 82% of Utahans said they "strongly" favored (48%) or "somewhat" favored (34%) maintaining roads and trails to disperse use and address environmental concerns. Sixty-eight per cent (68%) strongly agreed with the statement, "Roads and trails on federal lands in Utah which have historically been open to public use should remain open to public use." An additional 23% somewhat agreed, bringing the total support of the statement to 91%. The FS must recognize that providing for OHV use and protecting the environment means fully utilizing the inventory of existing roads and
65	17	I	TRANS.4030 0	1	By all proposed regulations and statements, YES, I believe the USDA-FS does not think OHV's should be utilized as an activity in the National Forests. The general ban on cross country travel and attempts to restrict OHV use, to the extent of citing "play areas" as a cross country travel problem, all lead me to believe if the USDA-FS could ban ALL OHV's, without an upraising, from entering the National

Public Concern Number 514

Public Concern Order 48

Public Concern The Forest Service should not validate user created roads by classifying them and designating them as open to motorized travel: a) because they were created illegally, b) to protect soils, c) to protect watersheds, d) to protect wildlife, e) to protect sensitive, threatened, and endangered plant and animal species, f) to protect roadless areas and potential wilderness, g) to maintain non-motorized recreational opportunities.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

-13	1	I	TRANS.4020 0	300	I am writing regarding the Forest Service's current proposal regarding which routes will be opened to motorized travel. I am afraid the current proposal will legitimize user-created trails and will allow vehicles to encroach into roadless areas, important wildlife habitat, and other sensitive areas.
-16	1	I	TRANS.4020 0	1	I was very pleased to recently learn that the Fishlake National Forest is creating an official travel plan that could determine how and where future motorized and non-motorized recreation will occur within the Fishlake. I support this planning process because it is long overdue and vitally necessary. However, I am concerned that the current draft proposal may give improper validity to unauthorized, user-created motorized routes
18	1	I	TRANS.4020 0	2	I am concerned that the Forest Service's current proposal regarding which routes will be designated as open to motorized travel (including off-road vehicle (ORV) use) will legitimize user-created trails and will allow motorized routes to encroach into roadless areas, important wildlife habitat, and other sensitive areas.
59	1	I	TRANS.4020 0	300	I am concerned about the Forest Service's current proposal regarding which routes will be designated as open to motorized travel (including off-road vehicle (ORV) use). I believe that this will legitimize user-created trails and will allow motorized routes to encroach into roadless areas, important wildlife habitat, and other sensitive areas.
100	1	I	TRANS.4020 0	1	The routes that I referred to as "new" are routes that are being added to the classified route system above what exists on the current Travel Plan. I didn't want to imply that I thought they were new construction; they were very clearly what I would consider to be user-created routes (by that I mean they exist only by virtue of someone driving over previously
55	1	I	TRANS.4020 0	300	I am writing with serious concerns about the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project. While I believe the FS's attempts to require vehicles to stay on designated routes and trails, I believe the current proposal regarding which routes will be designated as open to motorized travel (including off-road vehicle (ORV) use) will legitimize user-created trails and will allow motorized routes to encroach into roadless areas, important wildlife habitat, and other sensitive areas.

58	1	I	TRANS.4020 0	2	As a recreational user and as a Forest Service employee, I have become quite concerned over the last decade by the encroachment of OHV use in and on the forest lands. The damage that is caused by these machines is disgusting. Not only the damage to the landscape, but the damage to the soundscape. Please don't allow the OHV users to set the rules and run the game by turning created OHV trails into bonafide OHV routes. From what I've seen, they will just continue to create more.
21	1	I	TRANS.4020 0	1	I acknowledge that for many forest land users ORV's are their preferred way of exploring the beautiful Fish Lake Forest. However, I would strongly urge you to not allow 'user created' ORV trails to become permanent additions to the existing ORV trail systems
109	2	I	TRANS.4020 0	300	While I am gratified with your efforts to control off road vehicle abuse in the Fishlake National Forest, I do have some concerns. In particular, item 3 under "Nature of Decision To Be Made" in the "Fishlake National Forest, Utah, Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project" document indicates that some, possibly even all, of the 700 miles of currently unauthorized, illegal off road vehicle trails and routes could be designated as authorized trails. Unfortunately, and as you no doubt know, the act of authorizing these presently illegal routes would only serve to legitimize the creation of such trails by off road vehicle users. Worse, these scars on the forest will stay with us and even increase as off road vehicles users continue their perpetual search for new trails. There are numerous ORV-caused problems throughout Utah wildlands. Please do not add to this growing problem by adding currently illegal trails to the forest travel network.
100	2	I	TRANS.4020 0	131	I would like you to know that I intentionally did not include specific route information; as mentioned in the comments, I very strongly oppose the addition of any routes to the current Travel Plan, while strongly supporting the end to ALL cross-country motorized travel. The locations of these routes are immaterial; my point is that nothing can legally be added without strict compliance with current laws and regulations. My comments are intended to address serious procedural problems that I've found with the proposal. I cannot understand why the Forest Service would propose any additional classified roads or routes without knowing all there is to know about them. That is why every single addition to the current Travel Plan must go through the appropriate NEPA process. I'm pretty sure that the law is very clear on this.

108	2	I	TRANS.4020 0	1	Those routes that have been unofficially made should NOT be added to the travel plan, but instead should be deleted and the ground rehabilitated while you begin the phase-out of ORV use on the Fishlake NF.
70	2	I	TRANS.4020 0	165	In my several years of traversing the Fishlake I have seen the affect of unauthorized and unplanned trails gaining acceptance. I fear now that this project will have as an outcome, the legitimizing of such spurious paths across public lands even though Forest Service rule clearly indicates that " areas intended for motor vehicle use are not intended to be large or numerous," and that "designation of such trails will be based upon the protection of the resources of the public land."
-50	2	I	TRANS.4020 0	300	The Forest Service's current proposal regarding which routes will be designated as open to motorized travel (including off-road vehicle (ORV) use) will legitimize user-created trails and will allow motorized routes to encroach into road-less areas, important wildlife habitat, and other
175	2	I	TRANS.4020 0	300	I'm concerned, though, that the current proposal will legitimize user-created trails that were unauthorized in the first place and allow motorized routes to encroach into otherwise roadless areas of the forest.
22	3	I	TRANS.4020 0	1	In the past 10 years, skyrocketing ATV use has resulted in the creation of many new, illegal trails. Please don't codify those rouge ATV trails by designating them in your new travel plan.
106	3	I	TRANS.4020 0	1	Dismantle the Unauthorized Routes. We believe it is a serious mis-step to accept the illegal roads created by OHVs in the past and now bless them as acceptable travel routes. It would be preferable to close most of those and rehabilitate them with native vegetation
-16	4	I	TRANS.4020 0	300	The current proposal regarding which routes would be designated as open to motorized travel (including off-road vehicle (ORV) use) legitimizes unauthorized user-created trails and allows motorized routes to encroach into roadless areas, important wildlife habitats, and other sensitive areas.
171	4	I	TRANS.4020 0	510	2. The Fishlake OHV Route Designation Situation. It is my contention that: a. By adopting the Fishlake Travel Map as the start point for this process far to many miles of trails without meritous or legitimate status have been included and will therefore be legitimatised.

175	5	I	TRANS.4020 0	2	Legitimizing illegal trails sends the wrong signal to irresponsible users. I urge the Forest Service to restrict motorized travel to those trails originally designated for that purpose and close illegal trails.
47	6	I	TRANS.4020 0	1	Our specific objections are: The plan is wrong to approve the use of unauthorized routes that have been created by OHVs driving off the legal roads.
108	7	I	TRANS.4020 0	2	Your current proposal regarding which routes will be designated as open to motorized travel (including off-road vehicle (ORV) use) will legitimize user-created trails and will allow motorized routes to encroach into roadless areas, important wildlife habitat, and other sensitive areas. This is not good stewardship.
98	8	I	TRANS.4110 0	510	I recently visited the Monroe Mountain area of the Richfield District with a map of the proposed additions to the Travel Plan, and I did not find a single road or route that is a legitimate candidate for inclusion to the plan. In fact, many of the "roads" that access these currently unclassified routes are in such poor shape that they should be closed instead of encouraging more visitation and wear on these more remote locations.

Public Concern Number 515

Public Concern Order 49

Public Concern The Forest Service should implement an "Open unless signed closed" policy: a) to prevent making law abiding OHV riders criminals, b) to prevent non-motorized users from tearing down open signs.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
54	1	I	TRANS.4040 0	620	Really think if the trails were open unless marked closed, it would be much more enforceable and less confusing.
103	12	RM	TRANS.4040 0	620	The Forest must avoid a "Closed unless posted open" policy that is so highly desired by the environmentalists. This essentially declares all VARA people to be criminals and allows the closure of routes by anyone with the temerity to uproot signs. This idea, if implemented will create a disaster and an enforcement nightmare.

152	29	RM	TRANS.4040 0	620	7. General comments on OHV planning: h) Agencies are encouraged to utilize standardized trail signing and marking in order to lessen confusion. Trails closed unless otherwise marked open are not reasonable. Trails, when closed, should be signed with an official, legitimate reason. Monitoring should be implemented to justify the reasons stated. IMPORTANT NOTE: The Fishlake NF is to be commended for fully implementing the Utah State-Wide OHV Trail Signing Standards developed by the NRCC Technical Team. This is in stark contrast to the Dixie NF.
-----	----	----	-----------------	-----	---

Public Concern Number 516

Public Concern Order 50

Public Concern The Forest Service should implement a "Closed unless signed open" policy: a) to enhance enforcement of the travel plan, b) to prevent motorized users from tearing down closure signs.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
102	1	I	TRANS.4040 0	300	I live in Boulder, Utah, adjacent to the Dixie N.F. and as an ATV and forest user, I have witnessed an unprecedented increase in usage in the National Forest by ATV's. Many of these do not stay on trails and roads and has led to a degradation of the resource. Statistics bear out that the number of ATV users has increased dramatically and this trend is predicted to continue. I believe that in order to conform with your mandate to preserve the Forest in a sustainable manner for future generations, it is imperative that the proposed update to the travel plan take a proactive approach to this user group. I suggest a policy of roads being closed unless posted open to ATV's is -a logical first step.
45	2	I	TRANS.4040 0	1	Have a "closed unless open" road policy.
49	6	I	TRANS.4040 0	1	Closed unless designated open should be the rule.
98	7	I	TRANS.4040 0	820	I would like to strongly advocate having the route system designated exclusively by "open route" signage. Any route without specifically being designated open would be off-limits to motorized or mechanized uses, eliminating the temptation to merely remove a closed sign and feign ignorance.

-16	10	I	TRANS.4040 0	620	The forest-wide policy should be that only routes signed as open for motorized use may be used for this purpose. This signing policy is necessary to prevent new additional unauthorized user-created routes, and to not reward those who would remove any closed signs so that they could profess ignorance if stopped by a ranger.
-----	----	---	-----------------	-----	--

Public Concern Number 517

Public Concern Order 51

Public Concern The Forest Service should do a better job maintaining motorized roads and trails: a) to protect natural resources, b) to provide quality motorized recreational opportunities, c) for public safety.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
39	2	I	TRANS.4102 0	1	You made the trails, now maintain them.
154	2	I	TRANS.4100 0	300	Yes, things need to be taken care so our kids and their kids can enjoy them. And I'm willing to put time in to help that cause wherever possible. You say the use of ATVs have increased 172% in the last 8 years. Then the answer is not to shut down the trails but take care of them. I see bridges that have been made for ATV's and they're just barely wide enough to cross. If you happen to miss, you're going to slide of and damage will occur. After a couple of times the bridges are ruined. They need to be built to last in all aspects.
49	3	I	TRANS.4100 0	935	I completely agree that once the travel plan is in place and the road and motorized trail network has been established, that it must be a maintainable system under expected budget limitations.
154	4	I	TRANS.4100 0	331	Erosion is and has always been an important concern and problem, especially with vehicles of all kinds, I've seen places that people have had trouble, and they have made new routes around it. There are a couple of ideas I have: 1) When the trail is being made or redone, some of these trouble spots can and should be avoided or taken care of at that time. 2) Put some type of support braces in areas that are slipping to avoid further erosion. 3) Make sure that pipes are put in needed areas.

103	4	RM	TRANS.4100 0	510	I have been riding roads and trails in forests for 40 years, and can tell you that the claims of "damage" from this use are wildly exaggerated. Trails tend to gain overall benefits from motorized use because these people will clear obstacles and repair sections as necessary. The vast majority of trails receiving regular motorized use for generations are in excellent condition, especially considering they have received little or no official maintenance.
159	4	I	TRANS.4100 0	840	I also wish to comment of the condition and maintenance of the existing trail in this district, compared to those on the Monroe Mountain and Gooseberry. In short, trails such as the Face Trail and even the South Creek Trail are in very poor condition, to the point of being unsafe in many areas. Why is it that the trails in Sevier County and further north in Sanpete County are in such good condition and those in this district are in the state they are in?
171	10	I	TRANS.4100 0	510	3. Proposed Solution. The following solutions are proposed: c. Maintain trail system in accordance with the highest level of maintenance practicable, but in not case less that Level 3.

Public Concern Number 518

Public Concern Order 52

Public Concern The Forest Service should try mitigation of environmental impacts prior to closing motorized roads and trails: a) to maintain motorized recreation opportunities, b) to protect natural resources.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

196	3	I	RECRE.531 00	620	<p>With the Club's willingness to cooperate with the Forest Service in maintaining all the trails I URGE you to consider the following RATHER than closing the trails:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set achievable maintenance standards for all the trail systems; (water bars, culverts, rock removal, signing). 2. Possibly a rotation system to let certain areas rest for a period of time. 3. Limit organized use of certain trails by limiting the number of riders per day/week, etc. 4. Law enforcement of the agreed-to rules set by the Forest Service and Club. Without law enforcement the renegade element of the public will use these trails whether they are closed or not. The only people that will NOT violate the rules are the responsible people who are trying to work WITH you to maintain and protect the trail system. There are probably many other measures that could be agreed upon to protect the trail system and the environment. I urge you to pursue these options in reaching your decision.
152	16	RM	TRANS.4105 0	620	<p>Suggestions: a) The public wants the existing roads and trails left open to vehicle use. b) The existing network of roads and trails in the planning area should be considered an inventory with which to develop recreational trail systems. c) The Planning Team should look for management alternatives that provide for mitigation instead of closure. Options other than closure should be emphasized in each alternative. d) Alternatives, or management guidance, directives etc that require closure as the first or only option when resource impacts are identified should be avoided.</p>
152	23	RM	ALTER.2310 0	1	<p>7. General comments on OHV planning: a) USA-ALL requests that travel management alternatives be developed with the objective of including as many roads and trails as possible and addressing as many problems as possible by using all possible mitigation measures. Mitigation first, closure last.</p>

152	30	RM	RECRE.531 00	2	7. General comments on OHV planning: i) Current management philosophy seems to be that the only way to address a problem is by closing access to public lands. Eliminating opportunities does not solve problems. A more reasonable approach is to address problems through mitigation measures such as education, signing and structural improvements such as water bars, trail re-routing, and bridges. The FS is encouraged to utilize all trail maintenance and upgrading management techniques, such as, bridging, puncheon, realignment, drains, and dips to prevent closure or loss of motorized trail use. Trails should not be closed because of a problem with a bad section of trail. The solution is to fix the problem area or reroute the trail, not to close it. If funding or manpower is a problem, then other resources should be looked to including local volunteer groups, state or national OHV funding.
152	40	RM	TRANS.4000 0	610	USA-ALL believes that proper management is the key to reducing conflict and suggests that other management options, aside from closure, be implemented. Such options could include, but certainly would not be limited to: 3) Re-routing either use so as to avoid sections of roads or trails that are extremely popular with both groups. For example, a hiking trail can be constructed to avoid a section of popular OHV routes. Or an equestrian trail may be constructed to avoid a section of popular mountain bike route, etc. 4) Dispersing all forms of recreational use so as to minimize conflict and create a more desirable experience.

Public Concern Number 519

Public Concern Order 53

Public Concern The Forest Service should improve signage on the motorized travel system: a) to improve enforcement of the travel plan, b) to create a user-friendly route network.

Issue Number

Ltr# Cmnt# OrgType Action Rationale Comment

112	1	I	RECRE.531 00	2	I see 2 main problems with ATV use on the FLNF:1) Lack of adequate signage. In many, many places on the Loa RD, it is unclear which trails are open to ATV or only to horse/foot travel.1a) Frequently one finds 2-track "trails" "ruts" on trails designated on the map as horse and foot only. Very confusing.2) The map that identifies where ATV use is permitted costs \$7.00. Few people I contact (at the FI Discovery Desk) have seen the map, and often they don't want to pay \$7.00 for something they think (and I agree) should be free. We used we have a paper USFS Fishlake NF map (Travel Map) that was free. My comments are based on answering questions at the Fish Lake Discovery desk on weekends for 15 years, (as a Loa RD Volunteer), and I have been on every trail, ATV and horse/foot, over the past 5 years (also as a Loa RD volunteer).
107	6	I	TRANS.4140 0	2	We also want you to know we appreciate Kurt calling us on July 8, 2004 giving us permission to remove the signs behind our homes down to the Hancock road. We were very concerned about traveling near or on the HWY, as Kurt was able to experience with us on July 6th. We have removed those signs as well as the one a little further down Hancock road up to Elk Meadow (our name for it) that he also told us to take down as it never should have been closed. We have taken 2 of these signs and put back up south of Torgerson Flat where a new road has been created. This is shown on our map.

Public Concern Number 520

Public Concern Order 54

Public Concern The Forest Service should add facilities such as bathrooms, trail heads and kiosks to the motorized travel system: a) for public service.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
154	3	I	RECRE.500 00	500	Bathrooms are a great thing that has been put in, it's great to see people that are willing to go clean and take care of them.
152	26	RM	TRANS.4140 0	1	7. General comments on OHV planning: d) Where possible, agencies are encouraged to provide trailheads for popular trails.

Public Concern Number 521

Public Concern Order 55

Public Concern *The Forest Service should maintain access to facilities such as municipal water supplies, utility corridors, and other authorized special uses: a) to allow use, maintenance, and/or improvement of facilities.*

Issue Number

Ltr#	Cmnt#	OrgType	Action	Rationale	Comment
179	1	C	TRANS.4111 0	700	I would like to express a concern that a benchmark survey monument used as control point is located within the vicinity of proposed road closures. I would ask that access to the reference point would remain available.
197	1	C	TRANS.4105 0	2	The Bicknell Water Works trail (as it is locally known) is not shown on the map. This is a traditional route to access and service Bicknell's water system. This trail is also a favorite for local ATV outfitters as it provides for an easily accessible loop from Torrey, to Bicknell, and then over the Velvet Ridge back to Torrey. Please contact Bicknell Town Mayor Sherwood Albrecht at 425-3861 for more information about the town's water system and access. Please contact Tracy Potter, Malfunction Junction ATV, in Torrey, at 425-3345, for more info about outfitter use of this trail.
116	1	T	TRANS.4105 2	500	Bicknell Mayor Sherwood Albrecht, stopped by the Loa office and provided comment that the trail from Bicknell to their water system needed to be left open and maintained for their culinary system.
2	1	I	NRMGT.374 00	540	Access is needed for periodic inspection and maintenance as needed. Most of the access is two track trails and some roads. I believe this sort of access fits with permit compliance and with our desired condition for a utility corridor. This concern has a parallel application to the route designation project.
153	15	RM	NRMGT.370 00	520	Salina Creek - Mt. Terrill - How are you going to be able to service the radio tower?

Public Concern Number 522

Public Concern Order 56

Public Concern *The Forest Service should consider homeland security issues in its designation of a motorized travel plan: a) to protect municipal water supplies, b) to reduce the nation's dependence on foreign countries for oil.*

Issue Number

Ltr#	Cmnt#	OrgType	Action	Rationale	Comment
108	5	I	ALTER.2110 0	2	I also suggest that the forest plan take into account national security issues. Proclaiming "Pride in America!", driving huge vehicles pulling, and using, oil-wasting ORVS, then proceeding to tear the hell out of public lands is hypocritical. The dependence on foreign oil (and therefore foreign control) is terribly exacerbated by the use of ORVS.
108	6	I	TRANS.4000 0	2	It behooves the FS to encourage folks to help with national security issues by reducing the waste of oil, and thus reducing or (my preference) eliminating the use of ORVs on public lands. No doubt many will say it is "unrealistic" to advocate for the elimination of ORVs from public land. However, it is foolhardy and imprudent and doltish and short-sighted as well as awful stewardship to continue the reckless abuse of public lands by ORVs and the squandering of limited resources, both public lands and natural (oil, etc.) resources.

Public Concern Number 523

Public Concern Order 57

Public Concern *The Forest Service should close special use roads to the general public: a) to protect natural resources, b) to reduce road maintenance costs and/or vandalism, c) for public safety, d) for homeland security.*

Issue Number

Ltr#	Cmnt#	OrgType	Action	Rationale	Comment
-------------	--------------	----------------	---------------	------------------	----------------

198	1	U	TRANS.4110 0	2	I, Greg Solberg, operate and maintain the Utah Power and Light hydro-generation plant (Upper Beaver) 10 miles east of Beaver in Beaver Canyon. Two years ago I was asked if we wanted the roads we use to access and maintain our facility, pipelines, and intakes designated as ATV trails on the USFS maps. At that time we said that we would rather not and were told that was fine. According to the enclosed maps, these same roads are designated as ATV access. We would like to request that they not be so designated. In the past 2 years ATV/OHV traffic has greatly increased resulting in a higher rate of road deterioration and erosion, requiring us to spend more time maintaining these roads. We have also suffered more vandalism and theft of materials and equipment.
198	2	U	TRANS.4120 0	2	Utah Power and Light suggests the following: [SEE MAP] Suggested options: You will find 5 gated locations. At each of these locations we would like to install signs - sign 1, sign 2, or both. Sign 1 = [Road Closed, Authorized vehicles only], Sign 2 = [Dead End, No Through Traffic, Road Closed 2 miles ahead, Authorized Vehicles Only]. Sign 1 will permanently close the gated road section. We suggest that at the very least the road connecting South Fork and the Water Tank road be so designated. Also during wet conditions and early in the spring we would like to close the main access points using the gates and Sign 2 (from hwy 153 to Dry Hollow just west of the stream bed at the 'sawmill') and close (access into South Fork at the Kent's Lake road) if it is decided not to close these roads permanently to OHV/ATV traffic. This will allow us to control traffic into these areas and reduce the negative impact and extra maintenance, monitoring and losses.
46	6	P	TRANS.4000 0	819	Water developments, culinary sources, and utilities should be open only for administrative use or permittee maintenance, not the general public, for homeland security reasons. This is an issue that this process should address.
173	87	P	TRANS.4110 0	500	Attachment photo 9: UTM 414371 4260170Photo 1152. The photo shows an apparently active gravel pit. The Fishlake NF proposes a route which enters the gravel pit and makes a loop within the gravel pit. There should not be a public route into and around a gravel pit. The gravel pit should be a permitted use. Since it is likely the FS is the main user of the gravel pit it would be particularly liable for problems or hazards from permitting public use as an ATV area. The gravel pit should either be closed to allow ATV use or it should be closed to ATVs.

Public Concern Number 524

Public Concern Order 58

Public Concern The Forest Service should continue its support and management of the Paiute and/or Great Western Trail systems: a) to provide desirable motorized recreation opportunities, b) to support local economies.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
89	1	I	ALTER.2351 0	1	Please keep all OHV trails & dirt roads on the Paiute Trail & Fishlake National Forest open for use. They are well managed now.
95	1	I	ALTER.2352 0	811	My family and I have been taking annual trips to Utah from Arizona for the sole purpose of riding the Paiute Trail. This trail system is a tribute to its ability to share the forest with hikers, wildlife, cowboys, cattle, wild horses and Atv's. We just concluded our annual trip a couple of weeks ago, it included my brother from San Diego and his 2 kids, my brother from Anaheim and his wife and 3 kids, and my brother from Mesa, AZ and his wife and 3 kids. We all had a great time, exploring our National Forest, its splendor, wildlife and beauty. I support the Proposed Action with regards to Fishlake National Forest and the Paiute Trail.
84	1	I	ALTER.2352 0	810	We live in California but we come out to use the Paiute trail system in Fish Lake National forest, we love it. It is the best maintained OHV trail system we have ever seen. This year we were joined by several friends on the trails, we had a total of 33 riders. Everyone had a great time and were able to stay safe because of the trail systems. We strongly support the action proposed by Fishlake. We hope to continue riding for many years to come...
174	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	2	I would like to thank the forest service for it's continued support for the Paiute trail system. Myself and my family enjoy this trail system often. This trail system is well managed and demonstrates that there is room for multi-use of public lands.
177	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	1	DON'T CLOSE ANY OF THE PIUTE TRAILS AT FISH LAKE TO ATV'S!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

-78	1	I	RECRE.531 00	2	Having just come back from a Week (>700miles of riding) I must say this is the most beautiful, best maintained trail system I have ever been on. There were 31 of us ranging in age from 7 years old to 93. Everybody had an extremely good time. There was no evidence that people were riding off the designated trails, No LITTER, just beauty in every direction. A Great place to share the outdoors with the family. Please save it as an ATV heaven.
169	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	2	My family has been riding the Paiute Trail System many times, in fact many times each year. I have attended the Rocky Mountain ATV jamboree and loved it. With a 172% increase in the use of this Paiute Trail System and 142% increase in ATV sales in Utah alone it is obvious that the citizens of the state love it and this form of recreation. I find it hard to understand with these increases that we should close down roads and trails. It seems that with more people we should increase the amount of trails and places for people to go. I am not saying we should have the whole thing open to off trail riding, but the trails that are there shouldn't be closed.
79	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	We have been going to the Paiute trails for 4 years now and this trail system is by far the best set up system we've ever seen.
11	1	RM	PRCSS.1210 0	620	As a member of the Western Slope ATV Association in Grand Junction, CO, and a frequent visitor to eastern, central and southern Utah, I am interested in your individual responses to the questions below. Jacque and I have also attended the Rocky Mountain ATV Jamboree for the last 5 years, hence the question about the Paiute Trail. (NOTE: FS provided response) Finally, I am the webmaster for the WSATVA website (www.wsatva.org) and like to keep our members informed of developments of this nature.
85	1	I	ALTER.2352 0	1	The OHV trails or dirt roads on the Paiute Trail & the Fishlake National Forest are managed very well now. I strongly support the proposed action.
91	1	I	SOCEC.700 00	910	Let me express my opinion on the Paiute trail. It is undoubtedly the best thing for the economy, the environment and the people that like to recreate outdoors. First the local economy has boomed from enthusiasts from across the United States coming to this central part of Utah to spend their vacation dollars. I personally spend at least one long weekend every summer in Koosharem riding the trails with my family. I estimate we spend \$500 to \$1000 every trip on gas groceries, lodging, and restaurants.

87	1	R	ALTER.2352 0	1	As members of an active, family oriented, four wheel drive club, our members want you to know, they fully support the well balanced Travel Plan recently proposed by the Fishlake National Forest. We are strong advocates of the Great Western Trail and the Paiute Trail Systems, both excellent examples of OHV trail
170	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	811	PLEASE REGARD THIS REPLY AS A POSITIVE VOTE TO KEEPING THE PAIUTE TRAIL OPEN TO ATV'S AS THIS IS MY FAMILIES DREAM VACATION. THANK YOU FOR YOUR
13	1	I	TRANS.4000 0	620	Please accept this e-mail as my official comments on the Fish Lake National Forest Travel Plan. The Paiute ATV Trail is a wonderful and needed trail system and should be recognized as a great example of an OHV management tool. By providing properly regulated and limited OHV / ATV opportunities on this fantastic trail system you are able to properly manage the increasing number of citizens who enjoy motorized recreation on their national forest lands. Please continue to develop, maintain and promote the Paiute ATV Trail System.
77	1	I	TRANS.4000 0	1	Been riding the Paiute Trail System since 1999, it's a great asset to the area.
180	2	I	TRANS.4000 0	620	Your Paiute trail system is fantastic along with the new Arapeen Trail I rode last year. My 59-year-old sister and 4 other friends will be taking an extended ride on the Paiute Trail spending several nights camping out along the route. We appreciate and always ride on the designated trails and camp in the appropriate camping grounds. There are three generations in my family that ride with me.
76	2	I	PRCSS.1110 0	600	The Paiute trail system is nationally recognized as a prime example of how to implement a multiple use plan to allow for public use of public lands, and allow people to choose how they would like to use that land. I think that the anti's are afraid that other national forest managers view this plan as a model for multiple use recreation, and that would be a severe blow to their goal of removing motorized recreation from national forests and other public lands. I support the responsible use of public land for recreation, motorized and non-motorized, which this plan will provide. I applaud your efforts and urge you to stick to the plan and actively promote it to others in the Forest Service so that they can also implement a balanced multiple use plan on the forests that they manage.

65	6	I	TRANS.4105 0	2	The Paiute and Great Western trail systems are major well established trail systems. The only modifications that should be made to either of these systems is to ADD trails to them. Any reduction in trails in these major systems must be supported by specific environmental analysis studies, encompassing all factors and impacts, on the trail systems showing proof beyond a shadow of doubt that the trails need to be closed.
----	---	---	-----------------	---	--

Public Concern Number 525

Public Concern Order 59

Public Concern The Forest Service should maintain/create access points between local communities and National Forest: a) to support local economies, b) to support motorized recreation opportunities.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
52	1	I	TRANS.4082 0	2	You need a trail from the end of the oiled road 153 westbound to the ATV trail on Dry Flat. The town of Junction has no access to the ATV money from the riders.
24	1	T	TRANS.4000 0	915	In a phone conversation this morning with Gail Harris, Beaver City Treasurer, she said that she would like to see better access from the Fishlake and the Paiute ATV Trail into Beaver. She said that there are several businesses in Beaver that could provide services to those that are riding the trail, if they could only gain access to them. As an example, she said that Beaver has many hotels and restaurants that might benefit from trail riders' patronage, increasing opportunities for local economic development.
146	3	I	TRANS.4000 0	1	We need better access to Bicknell and Torrey.
197	7	C	PRCSS.1214 0	760	The Commission is very supportive of providing easily accessible routes from FS lands to Wayne County towns. Though the Commission realizes this is not a direct responsibility of the FS, the commission requests that the FS plan trails off the forests than can be linked to routes that access towns for the services they provide. We will be pleased to assist the FS with ensuring agency trails "mesh" with existing or, if necessary, new alternate jurisdiction trails and roads into nearby towns.

Public Concern Number 526

Public Concern Order 60

Public Concern *The Forest Service should convert the type of use occurring on a specific route or routes: a) to promote other motorized recreation opportunities, b) to promote ATV recreational opportunities, c) to promote non-motorized recreation opportunities, c) to protect natural resources.*

Issue Number

Ltr#	Cmnt#	OrgType	Action	Rationale	Comment
68	1	I	TRANS.40100	2	Att1: My suggestion is with road 212 in the Loa district, specifically that portion from Highway 72 south to Riley Spring area. Over the last few years there has been some erosion on the northern portion of this road and any repairs made have been limited. I feel this had made this particularly hazardous to full size vehicles and I recommend you consider limiting this to OHV only. My concerns are with a very small portion of this mainly that which lies in section 4 just south of where it leaves Highway 72 near Solomon, Arizona. As far as I can tell there has been no or very little truck traffic across this road in the last few years. However it has become a popular ATV route and offers scenic vistas that can inspire.
23	1	I	TRANS.40000	620	I showed Pat Yardley the map and we discussed that the upper portion of Indian & Shingle Creeks - he is in favor of the proposal and gives his support.
78	1	I	TRANS.41100	610	I am in favor of the proposed OHV project. I support local ranger Dayle Flanigan's recommendations, particularly as they relate to the closure of certain trails to OHV use. I am not opposed to the OHV riders having designated trails. I only believe those of us that wish to travel on foot or horseback have trails free of OHV traffic
165	2	I	TRANS.41051	810	Street legal vehicles should not be punished and restricted due to the actions of the individuals who own and drive OHV'S. We realize that Richfield has turned to this group of motorists to try to attract tourism to the area. I believe this same group of motorists will destroy a way of life that we have enjoyed for decades, is this type of profit worth it? With this in mind, our comments below address roads that we would like to see open for street legal vehicles (except as noted).
118	5	I	RECRE.50100	620	The forest should be open to all, not just a few lucky 4 wheelers. AT 72 I'm too old to learn 4 wheeling. I care for the land.

Public Concern Number 527

Public Concern Order 38

Public Concern *The Forest Service should prohibit play areas next to communities: a) to protect natural resources, b) to protect scenic integrity.*

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
46	3	P	TRANS.4032 0	2	Velvet Ridge should not become a "play area" because it's far from a community (like the Richfield play areas), doesn't receive significant use, and is in an area of great beauty. Once promoted as a play area, the scarring of the landscape will become more dominant.

Public Concern Number 528

Public Concern Order 61

Public Concern *The Forest Service should consider the impacts of displacing existing motorized use: a) to protect natural resources, b) to address future growth of motorized use.*

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
152	17	RM	RECRE.501 00	610	Suggestions: e) The Planning Team should carefully consider displaced use. Assuming that closures are eminent in some areas, one could calculate approximately how much existing motorized will be displaced to other areas. The Planning Team should develop alternatives that allow for additional access and additional recreational opportunities in suitable areas in order to properly manage

Public Concern Number 529

Public Concern Order 62

Public Concern *The Forest Service should consider the impacts of displacing non-motorized use: a) because existing non-motorized uses may be less than historic and/or potential levels of use, b) because motorize use has greater impacts than non-motorized uses.*

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
-------------	--------------	----------------	---------------	------------------	----------------

173	21	P	RECRE.501 00	630	<p>Has the FNF ignored or displaced non-motorized recreation users? What would be the demand for non-motorized use if there were not such extensive and intensive motorized recreation on the Fishlake NF? Researchers noted that "public land managers have mistaken the displacement of traditional recreationists by ORV users" as a decreased demand for these activities and have allocated more resources to the ORV users. (Bleich, 1988 cited in Stokowski and LaPointe, 2000) ORVs allow a minority of public land users to have an inordinate and disproportionate impact on the national forest natural environment. The use of OHVs effectively shrinks the landscape, truncating both the natural world and the availability of wildlife habitat. It also limits the number of users which can sustainably use the land. A recent research paper (Wisdom, et al., 2004) discusses the need to create a recreational user unit. Each ORV rider would represent at least three units. Mountain bike riders would represent 2 units. Hikers would represent one unit. The units are related to the impacts of each recreational user. Essentially each ORV user has the impact of 3 hikers. In terms of recreation that means one ORV rider displaces 3 hikers. (Wisdom, et al., 2004)</p>
-----	----	---	-----------------	-----	--

Public Concern Number 530

Public Concern Order 63

Public Concern The Forest Service should provide motorized access for elderly and handicapped persons who rely on OHVs for mobility a) as a matter of fairness, b) to comply with the American with Disabilities Act, c) because National Forests are public lands that should be able to be enjoyed by all Americans, d) to address future growth of motorized use.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
9	1	I	TRANS.4030 0	811	<p>I am a Disabled Veteran and I use an ATV to get out and see the outdoors. In limiting ATV routes you will be limiting my ability to see the National Forest. It seems to me that you will be discriminating against disabled and older people (I am both) who can only use this form of transportation to get out and really see the National Forests.</p> <p>I realize there are some people who do not follow the rules and make it harder on other people like me. But, why do you have to penalize the disabled because of the thoughtlessness of a few.</p>

180	1	I	RECRE.531 00	811	<p>My name is Ken Cluff and I live in Orem, Utah. I am 69 years old and I had a total hip replacement 4 years ago. I have been an avid outdoorsman all my life. I have been involved in the Boy Scout program for the past 43 years and I am a firm believer in protecting the environment. However, I am not an extremist as is the SUWA. I believe in using the backcountry but not abusing it. ATV riding in the backcountry under controlled conditions will meet the needs of all the public. With my disability, ATV riding is the only way I can get around in the backcountry now. My last ride this week took me to the West Desert of Utah. I went on the Amasa ATV Trail near Notch Peak. Several new trails had just been built and they were great. I always pick up garbage and carry out everything I take in. I was surprised at how clean the trail system was. This trail system is adjacent to a WSA to the west and I found the trails well marked and boundary lines respected.</p>
157	2	I	RECRE.531 00	2	<p>We can't hike anymore so the only way we have to see the beautiful country is by A T V. There is a lot of land and what little is used for trails doesn't hurt anything. We have also been right in the middle of wild animals and its not bothered them at all. Hikers scare the wild life more than the A T V,S do.</p>

159	2	I	RECRE.531 00	811	Let me tell you a bit about who I am, and my interest in this project. I have been actively riding 4-wheelers since 1998 and in the past have owned and ridden an all terrain motorbike. I am not a hunter and ride purely for recreation. My brother, who lives in Delta, and I ride several day each month, from early spring to late fall, and we have also had a great deal of fun ridding during the winter months. Next birthday, I will be 60 years old, and I consider myself to be a responsible and law abiding individual. A weekly ATV ride is something I look forward to, and I derive a great deal of enjoyment and recreation from it. As the cares and tensions of everyday life begin to fade, I often chuckle to myself when I catch myself singing and whistling as I ride along. I enjoy the fact that I can go places and see and do things; be in the open air and, in a real sense, right there, next to nature --'in the moment! The beauty, the sunshine, the wind, even the dust, and, most certainly, the solitude that I experience are something that I cherish, I appreciate and intend to pursue for a long time yet. For example, I have been amazed at the abundance, variety and beauty of the wild flowers I have seen this year. And I have spent considerable and enjoyable time photographing them. I hope to put together a video featuring them and many of the other sites we have experienced this spring and summer. Because we ride frequently, my brother and I have spent a great deal of time on the trails that will be effected by the pending plan. We ride most of the current trails in this district several times each season, and so far this summer we have spent time on the Monroe Mountain and riding in the
174	2	I	RECRE.531 00	811	Many of us, because of age or physical disabilities are unable to hike or ride a bike. For us, OHVs allow us to access the beauty of these wilderness areas that we would otherwise not be able to enjoy.
103	3	RM	TRANS.4000 0	811	You need to understand that an increasing number of your constituents are unable to access and enjoy the forests without the benefit of vehicles. An aging population will become less able to climb and hike long distances and will need to rely on mobility assistance. Don't forget those people who suffer from physical disabilities who must rely on vehicles for access. You can expect significant litigation in this area if you do not provide for their reasonable accommodation.
9	4	I	RECRE.531 00	811	If you close or limit ATV usage, then you will be closing or limiting access to the forest by me, a disabled veteran, and others like me who depend on this form of transportation to be able to get out and see our National Forests. Thus, discriminating against the disabled.

77	4	I	RECRE.531 00	811	I am a retired person who grew up in Southern Utah and find that the ATV is wonderful therapy for we senior's... Because of my age and a back injury I am no longer able to hike into the back country the way we used to. No longer having a choice, I must use a motorized vehicle for access to, and enjoyment of most public lands. OHV recreation is very important to me and a very legitimate use of public lands and National Forests. Further, we frequently avail ourselves of the opportunity to enjoy these public lands together as a family. Any decision to close these areas to OHV travel essentially deprives me, and others like me, of the opportunity to visit places we have been visiting for many years.
180	4	I	TRANS.4105 0	811	I would like to say that there are some sensitive areas such as Yellowstone National Park that needs special attention. However, an ATV trail around the eastern side the Yellowstone Lake would be a real neat experience. I can't hike and enjoy the great outdoor backcountry anymore but I still have a right to get out there. A motorized trail would certainly allow the handicapped and physically impaired, as well as those who simply enjoy ATV touring to have a quality out-door adventure away from the present freeway-like environment of restricted roads. I think it is extremely important that the Forest Service in all our National Forest to provide ATV trail systems for this group of the public.
77	5	I	TRANS.4110 0	811	In my opinion most closures of public land amounts to DISCRIMINATION! Yes, the closing of public land to OHV's is a blatant form of discrimination against those with handicaps and against senior citizens. (A status which eventually comes to all who survive).
159	7	I	RECRE.531 00	690	I will be 60 years old in December. That places me at the vanguard of the so-called "baby boom generations" which will shortly be moving into retirement. Every thing I read, hear or see in the media tells me that as we do so, it is not expected that we will spend those years in a rocking chair. And I suggest that one of the major recreational activities for those in this group will be ATVing. In fact, the majority of those riders we currently meet on forest trails are people in their 40's, 50's, 60's and even 70's. You need to consider this fact in your plans. ATV's, whether you like it or not, are not going to go away. A common statement that I hear time and again is that severely restricting use and access to public lands is only going to turn otherwise honest, people into law breakers. People want and need access to our national forests, and it should be oblivious that doing so on ATV's is a preferred way.

65	19	I	RECRE.531 00	2	The OHV activities should be properly managed, BUT, USDA-FS has already included them in the list of un-managed activities and HAS NOT proposed any real management guidelines, rules, or regulations, ONLY banning them from cross country. Sounds like a contradiction in their statements. "Managing this use along with other recreation uses and the need to protect natural and cultural resources has become increasingly more difficult with increased public demands" AND the lack of USDA-FS's adaptability, flexibility and desire! So, the USDA-FS has decided to discriminate against one activity in favor of others. It is discrimination because there is NO scientific evidence, only assumptions and a few irresponsible users.
65	28	I	TRANS.4031 0	811	"Motorized cross-country travel between or while searching for campsites or firewood is not allowed." This policy DISCRIMINATES against the disabled and the elderly. The disabled and the elderly NEED a means by which to participate in activities the same as persons without a physical impairment or disability. By prohibiting the use of OHV's, disabled and the elderly are confined and restricted, physically, in where and in what they can do. Thus, this policy DISCRIMINATES against the disabled and the elderly. This policy is like posting a sign that says "Wheelchairs are NOT allowed".

65	37	I	RECRE.531 00	847	FS-FAQ: How will route designation affect people with disabilities? Per the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, an individual with a disability will not, solely by reason of her or his disability, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity conducted by the Forest Service. All users, including those with disabilities are afforded the same motorized access opportunities and are subject to the same rules and restrictions. Motorized wheelchairs as defined in the Rehabilitation Act are not considered OHVs and therefore are not restricted by any of the alternatives. My Response: By definition of the above statement, if the only means, by which an individual with a disability, solely by reason of her or his disability, has, that allows them to participate in, enjoy the benefits of, a program or activity (such as hunting and camping) available to them in the National Forest is an OHV, THEN, they will be discriminated against. "All users, including those with disabilities are afforded the same motorized access opportunities", just not to all activities in the National forest afforded to all persons without a disability! That is discrimination against the disabled! The OHV, a fairly new form of travel, is the only means by which the disabled can participate in activities such as hunting, camping, sightseeing, etc. in areas that once was only accessible by persons without a disability. This policy is like posting a sign that says "Wheelchairs are
----	----	---	-----------------	-----	--

Public Concern Number 531

Public Concern Order 64

Public Concern The Forest Service should manage all forms of cross-country use, not just motorized use: a) because other forms of recreation create impacts, b) because it is not fair for motorized users to be the only ones who are restricted.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
10	1	I	TRANS.4030 0	1	Horses going cross-country. Hikers or skiers going cross-country. Snowmobiles going cross-country. They all will do damage to the environment and disturb

9	2	I	TRANS.4030 0	2	<p>Horses, hikers, skiers and snowmobiles can and do disturb the environment just as much as properly operated ATV's. Horses leave heavy footprints, waste and disturb wildlife. A number of shod horses crossing an area can and do tear up the ground. And then there is the waste they leave behind in the middle of the trail, which the horse riders are not required to "pack it out". But, now, if my dog (assistance dog) does something in the trail I would catch h--- if I don't clean it up. That sounds like discrimination to me. Hikers and skiers disturb wildlife and do damage to trees and streams also. And hikers have been known to start forest fires that destroy thousands of acres. You can not tell me that snowmobiles do not disturb wildlife, and, in the middle of the hardest season of all for them, too. Unless there is a deep layer of snow, snowmobiles will do damage to the vegetation, and, damage to vegetation in late spring does affect wildlife food sources. People DO damage to the environment and disturb wildlife, no matter who they are or what they are doing. There are always people who do not follow the rules. Tread lightly! applies to everyone, not just ATV's. So, why are the trails open to cross-country travel by horses, hikers, skiers, and snowmobiles but not ATV's? Snowmobiles are motorize vehicles, too. If the trails are to be closed to motorized travel then they should be closed to ALL motorized travel, including snowmobiles. ALL people, hunters or non-hunters, have just as much right to utilize public land, equally. By limiting public land usage during antler gathering and hunting seasons you are discriminating against the public as a whole in favor of hunters.</p>
10	2	I	PRCSS.1310 0	1	<p>Concerning invasive plants, soil erosion, etc.. Has there been any studies related to horses, hikers, and/or snowmobiles? I see much material concerning ATV's/OHV's but I have not seen any studies concerning other modes of cross-country travel . So, how do you know for a fact that PROPERLY OPERATED ATV's are that much worst than the other modes of travel.</p>

9	3	I	NRMGT.302 00	840	The bottom line, we are talking about PUBLIC land which should be opened to everyone equally. We do need rules and regulations. We do need traffic or usage control around campgrounds, on the trail, in play areas, etc.. But, it should be equal, applied to everyone, and all forms of land usage, not just ATV's. If you are going to close the forest to cross-country travel by ATV's, then you should close it to ALL forms of travel, including horseback, hiking, cross-country skiing, and snowmobiles. Otherwise you will be discriminating against one activity in favor of others. The key word here is travel. Racing should be left at the race track. Stunt riding, spinning doughnuts, reckless driving, and other such maneuvers should be banned. All rules of the road should apply including speed limits, noise levels, and staying on the road (trail).
65	4	I	TRANS.4030 0	300	Cross country travel: Has a comprehensive environmental analysis of cross country travel, encompassing ALL factors and impacts, been completed? Please answer "YES" or "NO" (It is either completed or not completed.) 1) If "YES", will the environmental analysis for each factor, activity, and impact be made available to the public in some way? I, personally, wish to see the environmental analysis of the invasive plant dispersal impact as related to natural factors, grazing, logging, mining, horseback riding, hiking, skiing, snowmobiling, and OHV use. It would be interesting to see which natural factor, activity, or utilization of forest resource contributes the most, percentage-wise, to the dispersal of invasive plants. 2) If "NO", then your conclusions and proposed plan are invalid because it is not based on "sound scientific knowledge" as required by the National Forest Management Act. If an environmental analysis of ALL factors, activities and impacts is not complete, BUT, there exists distinct problems/impacts involving cross country travel, THEN, ALL cross-country travel by ALL modes MUST be banned until an environmental analysis of the impacts can be completed. Identify and rate, on a percentage scale, ALL of the contributing factors, thereby, identifying the factors, scientifically, not by assumptions, that contribute the most to the impact and must
10	4	I	PRCSS.1310 0	300	What impacts are created by cross-country travel of OHVs? What impacts are created by cross-country travel of the other modes of travel? You have not

10	5	I	PRCSS.1310 0	471	How do OHVs contribute to the problem of invasive plants? How do other modes of travel contribute to the problem of invasive plants? You have not addressed this. Snowmobiles, horses, and hikers pick up mud and other debris also. Plant seeds attach themselves to horse coats and trousers of hikers. There are many more hikers in the National Forest than ATV's. How many ATV's actually travel through mud AND pick up invasive plant seeds?
10	6	I	PRCSS.1310 0	331	How do OHVs create soil erosion? How do other modes of travel create soil erosion? You have not addressed this. Anytime we attempt to modify or adapt a natural area for our use, we create the conditions for soil erosion.
10	8	I	TRANS.4030 0	840	If, you are going to ban cross-country travel by one mode of travel, you need to ban ALL modes of cross-country travel. A ban on ALL or a ban on none, or else it is discriminating. I AM FOR THE BAN ON ALL CROSS-COUNTRY TRAVEL! (With a few exceptions: search and rescue, hunting (on foot), retrieving hunter's downed game by pack horse or OHV, etc..) But, whether or not there is a ban needs to be based on hard data. Just be equal, all or none!
65	12	I	TRANS.4030 0	2	This project will directly or indirectly influence 3 of the 4 threats" by discriminating against one. Either ban cross country travel to ALL modes of travel OR open it to ALL. That is the only FAIR way. The USDA-FS has placed ALL of the blame of un-managed outdoor recreation on OHV's. This is discriminating against OHV's and the people who use them, INCLUDING THE DISABLED! As quoted from: "Delivering Natural Resource Values: Four Threats to Our Mission" Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth-Israel Visit Volcani Center, Israel February 10, 2004, Four Threats. That brings me to the four threats. In the past, people focused on timber harvest and road building as the biggest problems on national forest land. In my view, those just aren't the biggest threats we face. The biggest threats today are fire and fuels, invasive species, loss of open space, and unmanaged outdoor recreation.
65	14	I	TRANS.4030 0	840	Cross country is NOT a trail. This FAQ is a deceptive means to validate the National policy of banning OHV's from cross country. Either ban cross country travel to ALL modes of travel OR open it to ALL. That is the only FAIR way.

65	15	I	RECRE.501 00	300	Both types of recreational opportunities are NOT being considered! The USDA-FS's answer to this is an outright lie! The USDA-FS on a National level has issued a generally order to CLOSE all cross country travel to OHV's without considering and evaluating the impacts caused by other modes of cross country travel.
65	20	I	TRANS.4030 0	440	If there is/are rare plant(s) present, then all other factors and impacts are not relevant. The area containing this/these rare plant(s) MUST be CLOSED to ALL cross-country travel. Therefore, stating the present of a rare plant is an invalid reason to ban ONLY ATV's.
65	40	I	PRCSS.1310 0	400	If a study of invasive plant dispersal related to ATV travel has been completed but has not been complete for most of the other modes of travel and forest resource utilization, then your conclusions are not valid. If the USDA-FS has not completed studies of invasive plant dispersal related to weather, wind, water, wildlife, fire, grazing animals, mining, logging, horseback riding, hiking, skiing, snowmobiling, etc., then they have no basis for accusing ATV's of being the major cause in the spreading invasive plants. Yes, ATV's can spread invasive plants, but are they the major factor in the distribution of the plant seeds? Or, are they really the least likely to spread the plant seeds? Without a study of ALL factors and relating them to each other on a percentage scale, the environmental analysis of this problem has NOT been completed. Example: How does the USDA-FS know, by scientific fact, that wind is not the major factor in the dispersal of invasive plants and ATV's are, percentage-wise, insignificant. IF the USDA-FS does know this, then their statements on ATV dispersal of invasive plants is designed to misdirect and mislead the public, because invasive plants are going to spread just as fast whether ATV's are present or not.
65	41	I	TRANS.4031 0	1	Close ALL cross-country travel until an environmental analysis of ALL factors can be completed, with a few exceptions, such as search and rescue, law enforcement, retrieval of down game, DISABLED PERSONS ACCESS to ALL of the National Forest including cross country travel for hunting, camping, and access to other parts of the forest that normal, non-impaired users have. Otherwise you are discriminating against OHV's and the disabled.

65	45	I	PRCSS.1310 0	300	The question is "How do OHVs create soil erosion?". The answer addresses soil erosion, generally, but not specific to OHV's. Soil erosion coming from cross-country travel is caused by any number of factors that cause the disturbance of the natural weathering of the soil. Anything from a human footprint to a forest fire can and will cause soil erosion. That is, the erosion of the soil more rapidly than what is found naturally. Soil erosion does occur naturally and at varied rates depending on the soil type, slope, vegetation cover, wildlife usage, climate, and weather. Factors such as hiking, horseback riding, skiing, snowmobiles, livestock, grazing, logging, mining.
----	----	---	-----------------	-----	--

Public Concern Number 601

Public Concern Order 65

Public Concern The Forest Service should open or keep open specific routes and/or areas to motorized use: a) to provide motorized recreation opportunities, b) to provide loop routes, c) to maintain access to private land inholdings, d) to provide hunting, fishing, and camping access, e) to address future growth in motorized use, f) to reduce use/user conflicts, g) to protect natural resources, h) for public safety, i) to allow greater Forest access to the elderly and handicapped, j) to be consistent with opportunities/restrictions on adjacent lands, k) to facilitate travel plan enforcement.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
41	1	I	TRANS.4105 1	620	I recommend that the Little Res/Kents Lake Road be opened to ATV's or else maybe an ATV travel made parallel to the road. This would make this area a lot more ATV friendly user and give us access from campgrounds to trails.

181	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	2	At a recent public meeting in the Sevier County Court House concerning the above subject it appeared from your maps as follows:1) The trail (old original road) which I have highlighted on the attached map is not included as being left open to travel by "motorized vehicle". This is a portion of the original road which accessed Hancock Flat and the Fishlake Hightop area.2) This trail provides access to some excellent camping and hiking as well as a chance to leave the main traveled way and the associated conflict with larger vehicle traffic - even if only for a couple of miles. I feel that this trail should be left open for the above reasons, plus, some personal family history wherein my father worked at a sawmill which stood at Mud Spring in the period of 1906-1912 and I still enjoy going there.
42	1	I	TRANS.4105 1	620	I recommend that the grassy road in Indian Creek be left open to ATV's. This old mining road is already established and used by many 4-wheeler enthusiasts.
135	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	815	Don't close Hennessey Point this is one of the most interesting for picture taking.
40	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	There is a trail that goes from Last Chance Hollow off North Creek Road & goes north to Indian Creek Road. Great trail, would like it to remain open.
122	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	Loa District North1) ATV trail that goes along side of ditch (was old road at one
123	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	Please do not close Hennessy Point. This is a very popular spot on the Cottonwood
138	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	815	Hennessey Point should be left open it is such a great view and nice ride off main
160	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	We are writing in regards to the recent meeting held by the Beaver Forest District. Forest ranger Dell Flanigan proposed the closing of forest ATV trails along with existing roads on the Beaver district Fishlake National Forest. We, the concerned citizens of Beaver, do not agree with the closer of existing roads and trails that have been in place and used for more than a hundred years, such as the roads up Twitchel Canyon and associated mining roads and trails running from the north and south. He has proposed to close eighty-two miles of ATV trails on the beaver mountain, which amounts to one-third of the trails.
134	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	I have been riding the Piute Trail for about 3 years and Hennessey Point is one of my great interests - should be left open.

-188	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	2	We are writing to inform you of our concerns concerning the closing of roads and trails on the Fish Lake National Forest in the Fish Lake area. We have property and homes in the Quakie Haven area of which we have been riding and enjoying the many roads and trails on the Hancock Road to Hancock Flat and up to High Top and on down through Rust Springs and off the face of the mountain back to the Hancock Road turnoff from the main highway for all our lives. (30+ years) We have also enjoyed the roads and trails on the east side of the lake on the Mytoge Mountain and certainly hope all those existing roads and trails will remain open. We are writing to request that all the trails and roads that have existed for 30 to 80 years remain open. We also request that some of the trails that were arbitrarily closed last fall off the Hancock road be reopened. We have a map enclosed with this letter showing our proposed recommendations for the Hancock and High Top areas. Please review them and consider our requests for the roads to
124	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	915	The trail from Barney Lake to Willow Springs needs to be kept opened & signed.
114	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	620	Kimberly trail from Kimberly to Tip Top (tr-050, xt-564, tr-214), then south to Trappers Pride and down to Fish Creek - nice trails should be open for ATV use.
35	1	I	TRANS.4000 0	620	Why have trails been closed to get from Marysvale to Puffer Lake/ Why couldn't at least one trail be open to ATV's that would let people cross the mountain range without having to back track 1 t 20 miles. Same question pertains to Scipio - Oak City. All continue to a point where a 1 1/2 mile portion stops the trail from crossing mountain range.
113	1	I	ATTMT.9999 9	620	Attachment 1: Map showing 8 routes that would like open.1) Established road to stock pond (U1855)2) Old road now established ATV trail (TR-114)3) Old road to Tom Jones Bench established 50 years plus (U1854)4) Ditch maintenance road and ATV route (U1852)5) Ditch maintenance and ATV route (U1853)6) Established ATV trail (xt-076)7) Established ATV Trail (tr-146)8) Old road 50 years plus, established ATV trail (tr-143, 114)

150	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	811	Please don't close roads in Indian Creek - Beaver County. My husband mined there in the late 50's and early 60's. My family goes there to camp in the summer. We usually go up Twitchell Canyon to the mine on my husband's birthday in August. We take the grandchildren and great-grandchildren to teach them about their grandfather. It has always been a favorite spot. We do no harm to the environment and love that canyon. Family traditions are an important part of our heritage. We love and respect our FREE country and the land. Don't deprive us of our freedoms.
38	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	1	The Clover Beds Road should be left open to OHV's.
110	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	815	The road into Buck Flat above Fishlake's South end on the west is not on your map - this is a good ATV trail & gives ____ over-looks without opening up the Fishlake High Top.
128	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	The Pipeline Trail from #01 to #73 Kingston Springs to McCurdy Springs should be on the ATV travel map.
51	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	1	Would like 1093 open. Can see no reason why Circleville Peak Road cannot be open. Put up a post fence and give people some place to go.
33	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Need Barney Lake trail from Anderson Canyon to Barney Lake, was closed up until 2003.
139	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	815	Do not close Hennessy Point! This is a very beautiful spot with a spectacular view!

193	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	2	<p>This letter is to voice concern about the Forest Service's proposed plan to limit travel on and use of the Fishlake National Forest. Several weeks ago I attended a meeting in Junction, Utah, conducted by the Forest Service to introduce their OHV Route Designation Project. In this meeting I asked several Forest Service, Officials the reason why Road No. 1093 was closed. None of these people could give me an answer, also there was concern voiced about the closure of the road to Circleville Peak. These two roads give people access to some of the most panoramic views on the Fishlake National Forest. These roads have been used for many, many years by hunters, sightseers and other people. They are roads or trails that are not steep or dangerous trails for OHV travel and due to their locations there are very few places people can ride OHV's off the trail and cause damage to the surrounding areas. Also the erosion caused by these trails is very minimal. Because of the outstanding views, especially in the fall, from these trails and the fact that most older people could not walk these trails, they should be opened at least to OHV travel so people can enjoy the views and seeing the wildlife. I would appreciate a reply to this letter about the closing of Route No. 1093 and the road to Circleville Peak.</p>
131	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	<p>Have rode the trail to Hennessey Point for 10 years it is a must each trip up Cottonwood please leave open.</p>
53	1	I	TRANS.4105 1	815	<p>Please open the Bean Hill Road (the road that is above Little Meadows Creek). It is a good lookout point and is a beautiful area. I know that it has been a road for a long time and I wondered why it was closed. Please keep it open so people can see it.</p>
127	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	<p>Please keep the trail from Barney Lake #157 to Willow Springs and Anderson Canyon open. It is a great trail and so much fun to ride.</p>
133	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	<p>Please do not close the trail leading to Hennessy Point. This is a very beautiful location that we enjoy every year when we come to this area.</p>
184	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	<p>Map attachment 1: Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG. Hunter & recreational access.</p>
126	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	<p>I hope you can see your way to keep the trail open from Barney Lake to Willow</p>
145	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	<p>I would like to still be able to run from U.M. Creek down to Danish Meadows and onto some of the open trails east of there & back over to Forsyth Reservoir.</p>

30	1	I	TRANS.4105 1	1	I am a ATV user and we have a cabin by the south end of Fish Lake. I would like to NOT CLOSE the road to the south end of Fish Lake.
151	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	620	Short road along forest boundary below Sleepy Hollow cabins. A lot of ATV, motor cycle & horse back riders use this road to stay from main road traffic on the Mytoge Road.
183	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 1: We ride this route during the summer and winter months, we need to have this route open during the summer. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
185	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 1: Please change this route to OPEN SEASONALLY. We have rode this trail for years, please leave them
182	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 1: Please change this route to OPEN SEASONALLY. We ride during the summer and hunting seasons,
147	1	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	I would like the access trails on the Beaver District to Fish Creek to remain open. The one in Section 16 - (trail) #214 to Parks Sawmill should remain open. Also the trail along Wilson Creek down to the waterfalls and the main road to Fish Creek & Picnic Creek (TR-212, 048, 1043). These need to remain open. Closing these makes Fish Creek totally inaccessible to the public.
132	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	The trail from Willow Springs to Barney Lake needs to be opened & signed.
148	1	I	ATTMT.9999 9	740	This road goes into my private property. It must remain open to motorized vehicles so that we can access our property.
146	1	I	TRANS.4000 0	1	We need better access into Shingle Creek. We also need to open up Rattlesnake through to Tip Top near Kimberly.
125	1	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	Henessy Point needs to be left open. This is on the Cottonwood Loop, west of
145	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Reopen the trail from Beaver Ponds west over to the ATV Trail #248 that runs into the Gooseberry Road and already ATV trails - Just under Wind Storm Peak-West.
185	2	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 2: Please change this route to OPEN SEASONALLY. This trail has been open for years, leave it alone.
146	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	623	We need to open Beaver Dams near Johnson's to properly finish off the loop.
139	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	815	Please add Pipeline Trail to the trail system. This high meadows offers beautiful riding and scenery.

138	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Pipeline from #01 Kingston Springs to McCurdy Springs to #73 should be opened and on trail map.
132	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	Henessy Point on Bullion needs to be kept opened. It is enjoyed by many.
140	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Henessy Point should not be closed.
114	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	815	Trail north of Richfield runs south of Table Mountain along south rim of Willow Creek then southwest to overlook Cottonwood and Little Valley. Old Pioneer Wood Road - very scenic trail - should be open for ATV
141	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Henessy Point should not be closed.
-188	2	I	TRANS.4105 0	811	We would also like to request that you reconsider the closing of the South Fish Lake Basin to ATV's. The one road in from the Mytoge Road to the east side of the sewer ponds up to the south east side of the lake is a beautiful drive and very enjoyable for people on ATV's; more so than those in pickups and jeeps because the road is quite rough, but for some reason they are still allowed to enjoy that area, but closed to ATV's which are not nearly as hard on the trail as the big 4 wheel drive trucks are. To have this road open to go into the south end of the lake and go out on the same road gives we individuals that enjoy the great out of doors on ATV's a wonderful place to ride for a day of fun and a picnic with our families, so we took can enjoy the beauty of the lake.
186	2	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	I have ridden the trail up Brush creek numerous times. The scenery is beautiful. It is the only way that I am able to get to that part of the mountain. If the trail is closed I will no longer be able to see that part of the mountain. The only way then to get other than by horse will be to walk. This would take me over 8 hours to do. I feel that this is unreasonable when this trail started as a county road, converted to a ATV trail by the Forest Service. This only allows access to a small area of the Sulfur dale area. Most is only accessible by foot or horse. I know several individuals that are angry about this proposal because of these reasons.
107	2	I	TRANS.4000 0	811	Since we own property and have homes at Quakie Haven, we spend the summer there. We have been riding and enjoying the many roads and trails on the Hancock Road to Hancock Flat and up to High Top and on down through Rust Springs and off the face of the mountain back to the Hancock Road turnoff from the main highway for all our lives (60 years). We have also enjoyed the roads and trails on the east side of the lake on the Mytoge Mountain.

135	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	We have rode the Pipeline Trail from Kingston Trough for over 3 years. Goes from 01 to #73 Kingston Springs to McCurdy Springs. I think this should be put on the ATV travel map.
137	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	620	Put signs on #157 Barney Lake to Willow Springs thru Anderson Canyon, open it up, great ride!!
184	2	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 2: Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG. Hunting & recreational access.
128	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Please do not close Henessy Point lookout on the Cottonwood Loop, west of
30	2	I	TRANS.4105 1	660	I would like to open up the last quarter mile so we can drive into the lake to site see and fish. (Fish Lake)
123	2	I	TRANS.4140 0	811	Please sign the trail by Barney Lake to Willow Springs.
197	2	C	TRANS.4105 0	1	The south end of Fishlake should be open for OHV access. The proposed action shows that this area will be closed to motorized use. The Wayne County Commission strongly opposes this designation and urges routes be reopened in the south end of the basin.
125	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	A Traveled trail is not on the Travel Map. It is the Pipeline Trail from #01 to #73 - Kingston Springs to McCurdy Springs.
133	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	Please do not close the area known as the "pipeline". This high meadow offers beautiful riding and scenery.
182	2	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 2: Please change this route to OPEN SEASONALLY. We ride during the summer and hunting seasons,
134	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	623	Make the Barney Loop off #157 Barney Lake to Marysvale thru Willow Springs and Anderson Canyon open.
129	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Henessy Point should not be closed.
122	2	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	Loa District North2) ATV trail that goes along side of ditch.

193	2	I	TRANS.4120 0	600	A concern I have is the location of the gate approximately 9 miles West of Marysvale on the Beaver Creek Road. I understand the reason for closing the upper portion of this road in the winter and spring because of the damage that can be done to the roadway and surrounding area when the ground is wet and soft. But because of the rocky condition of the roadway for several miles West of the present location of the gate, very little damage can be done by travel on the roadway. If the gate was moved farther up the canyon this would allow picnickers, campers and sightseers access to some very scenic areas.
136	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	623	The trail from Barney Lake #157 to Willow Springs thru Anderson Canyon would be a great loop to Marysvale.
183	2	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 2: We ride this route during the summer and winter months, we need to have this route open during the summer. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
37	2	I	TRANS.4105 1	1	Leave the 4 WD road open in Section 34/5 down to Fish Creek.
127	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	815	Please do not close Hennessey Point as this is the highlight of the Cottonwood Loop and the most beautiful for taking pictures.
158	2	I	TRANS.4105 0	2	Following is a series of short comments about trail by number or description that I believe should remain open to ATV use.1. 057-From Hancock road should be left open, as it becomes part of a scenic loop.2. Trail north of Richfield runs south of Table Mountain along the south rim of willow creek and southwest to the overlook of cottonwood and little valley. I understand this was an old pioneer wood gathering road.3. Very picturesque trail from Kimberly to tip top then south to trappers pride and fish creek.4. Road to south end of Fishlake past sewer lagoons so you can fish from the shore. ATVs would be much kinder to the road than pickups.5. In the Fishlake area the trail about a mile from hwy 25 on Hancock road, northeast to some large flats. Great deer hunting.6. Hansen's docking corral trail.7. Gahew spring to Tasha spring to Daniel pass. Beautiful and a great round trip.
151	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	815	Trail 057 off Hancock Road. Very scenic side trail off main road. Beautiful during fall (ATV Jamboree, etc.) for photographing fall foliage & wildlife. Deer lay in brush undisturbed and watch ATV's go by.
130	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Henessy Point should not be closed.

164	2	RM	TRANS.4050 0	620	I will enclose a justification I wrote last year about the Horse Flat Trail. As I understand the plan, a portion of it will be open seasonally, which is certainly a step in the right direction.
110	2	I	TRANS.4000 0	1	The Hightop Road should be left like it is - no more access on top, but no less.
156	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	2	The little dead end trail from the main road above Bullion Canyon, which goes only a short distance to Hennessey point with a turnaround and return by the same route is proposed for closure but should remain open. This has always been a very popular side trail, providing access to the old cabin, the old mine, a picturesque little stream, and some fantastic scenery down the rock cliffs with Marysvale and the Sevier River in the distance. It is a relatively short trail with an adequate turnaround at the end, and provides no access to other areas nor off-road. It would be a shame to isolate this beautiful, popular, scenic attraction.
38	2	I	TRANS.4105 0	1	Indian Creek & Twitchell Canyon should be left open to OHV's.
159	3	I	TRANS.4105 0	811	Because I believe that I have a right, just as much so as someone on foot, in a pickup or on horseback to have access to these experiences and opportunities, I am very concerned with the proposal to restrict access to Indian Creek Canyon beyond the Pole Canyon intersection, and the shutting down of the Grassy loop. For years, we have enjoyed riding up the North Fork of North Creek to the meadows, taking the trail, an old road, over the mountain and down to the Indian Creek road. From there we either ride up to the reservoir or west to the Grassy intersection -- where we some time do a loop up past the old mine property which by older bother operated and my dad and two other bothers all worked in -- or continue on to the Pole Canyon turnoff and back, either to the North Fork, or past Sheep Rock to town. I first crossed the old road I am referring to as a youngster of 10 or 11 years old in a Model A Ford, my sister-in-law driving and me hold a bassinette containing her infant daughter, between us on the seat. My older brother operated Uranium mines in bother North Creek and Indian Creek in the 1950's. We enjoy taking friends and family to the old mine sites and sharing stories and family history with them. And, again, I see no reasonable or logical reason to shut these areas down.
184	3	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 3: Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG. Hunter & recreational access.

186	3	I	TRANS.4105 0	2	Last week my wife and I rode to Mumford lake and the one to the west of it (Censibaid). If we had to walk it would have taken most of the day with the arthritis that my wife suffers she would not be able to even make the trip. The scenery is beautiful. The view to circle valley mountain is superb. It was a very enjoyable day. If you close these trails myself and Wendy will no longer be able to enjoy these areas. We have made this trip two to three times per year for several years and see no reason for the areas to be closed.
124	3	I	TRANS.4105 2	915	Please don't close Henessy Point Trail on Cottonwood Loop Road.
123	3	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	Pipeline Trail from #73 to #01 should be added to the system and signed.
126	3	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Please don't close the trail to Henessy Point, off of Cottonwood Loop Road.
182	3	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 3: Please change this route to OPEN SEASONALLY. We ride during the summer months and during the hunting seasons.
183	3	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 3: We ride this route during the summer and winter months, we need to have this route open during the summer and hunting season. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
141	3	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Barney Lake to Anderson Canyon Trail should be included on the trail system.
138	3	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Open and make available #157 from Barney Lake to Willow Springs thru Anderson Canyon.
133	3	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	The trail from Willow Springs to Barney Lake is a very "special ride". Please place signs on this trail & make it available for greater enjoyment.
130	3	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Barney Lake to Anderson Canyon Trail should be included on the trail system.
151	3	I	TRANS.4105 0	660	South Shore Fishlake - access from sewer ponds & Mytoge Mountain Road. Only access to Fish Lake for ATV's. A beautiful view down to the lake all year round and access to fishing from the south shore. I feel 4 X 4's do more damage to the meadow here. A suggestion would be to make it a seasonal road open to all and have some sort of barrier blocking the meadow area off to any vehicles with a road around this
129	3	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Barney Lake to Anderson Canyon trail should be included on the trail system.

164	3	RM	TRANS.4105 2	620	There is also a short trail up Chalk Creek Canyon south of the creek and just south of the hieroglyphics. It was used as a wood gathering road and deer hunting access in the past and is used as a short loop by many ATV riders. We would like to see this trail added to the proposed trails to remain open. It is in the well-hidden in the cedars and is only visible from the hieroglyphics.
197	3	C	TRANS.4105 2	1	The proposed action also shows the Fishlake High Top trail closed to motorized use. The Commission does not support this closure and requests that this trail be opened, year round, for OHV use.
139	3	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	The trail from Willow Springs to Barney Lake is a very "special ride". Please add this to the trail system.
140	3	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Barney Lake to Anderson Canyon Trail should be included on the trail system.
156	3	I	TRANS.4105 0	623	There is a well used loop trail from Kingston Springs and McCurdy Springs (#73). The pipeline trail through Kingston Troughs connects with trail #73 and should remain open.
131	3	I	TRANS.4105 2	623	Sign and open Barney Lake #157 via Willow Springs thru Anderson Canyon - nice loop to Marysvale.
136	3	I	TRANS.4105 2	815	Hennessey Point should not be closed it is one of the neatest points of interest the view is spectacular and very interesting.
122	3	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	Loa District North3) Old road that goes out to Jones Bench (been there 50 years plus).
185	3	I	TRANS.4105 0	650	Map attachment 3: Please change this route to OPEN SEASONALLY. I and my friends have spent many years of good hunting, please leave trail open.
137	3	I	TRANS.4105 2	815	Leave Hennessey Point open this is a great attraction for the Piute Trail.
114	3	I	TRANS.4105 2	650	Fishlake area: Trail about one plus miles from Highway 25 on Hancock Road runs northeast up to some big flats. I have hunted deer on for 50 plus years, my only access now is on ATV's/
110	4	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	The access to the south end of Fish Lake is being shown as closed - this is the only access to the lake for ATV's and should remain open.
128	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Keep the Barney Lake to Willow Springs trail open & signed.

132	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	There is a beautiful trail off Paiute 01 by Kingston Trough - called the Pipeline that starts off Paiute 01 and comes over and ends on Paiute 73.
184	4	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 4: Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG. Hunter & recreational access.
131	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Put Pipeline Trail on map off #01 Kingston Springs to McCurdy Springs to #73.
129	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Pipeline Trail from Kingston Canyon through to trail #73 via McCurdy Springs should be included on the travel system.
197	4	C	TRANS.4105 0	1	Access to Hancock Flat should be provided. This is an area that has motorized access and use and should be
182	4	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 4: We ride this route during the summer months, we need to have this route open during the summer. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG. Keep side trails open.
151	4	I	TRANS.4105 0	815	Gahew Spring over High Top to Tasha Spring - this is a very beautiful & scenic ride. One our jamboree riders love. Lots of photographic opportunities for interesting land scapes and wild flower viewing. We have taken people from the US & Europe here. We never get tired of the views. This should not be closed but better as a seasonal road as in the early spring and late fall. It seems pick-ups are the damaging factor across the marshy areas & areas prone to spring run-off.
107	4	I	TRANS.4105 0	2	We would also like to request that you reconsider opening the South Fish Lake Basin to ATV's as you are completing your map planning. We have marked on our map in RED the road and have one way in and the same way out. This way no 4 wheelers disturb the public campgrounds. The one road in from the Mytoge Road to the east side of the sewer ponds up to the south east side of the lake is a beautiful drive and very enjoyable for people on ATV's; more so than those in pickups and jeeps because the road is quite rough, but for some reason they are still allowed to enjoy that area, but closed to ATV's which are not nearly as hard on the trail as the big 4 wheel drive trucks are. To have this road open to go into the south end of the lake and go out on the same road gives we individuals that enjoy the great out of doors on ATV's a wonderful place to ride for a day of fun and a picnic with our families, so we too took can enjoy the beauty of the lake.

122	4	I	TRANS.4111 0	620	Loa District North4) Road closed illegally by F.S. with no public input or comment (it is a ATV route).
130	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Pipeline Trail from Kingston Canyon through to trail #73 via McCardy Springs should be included on the travel system.
135	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	623	A good loop to Marysvale would be #157 Barney Lake to Willow Springs thru Anderson Canyon.
140	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Pipeline Trail from Kingston Canyon through to trail #73 via McCard Springs should be included on the travel system.
165	4	I	TRANS.4105 1	2	Fillmore - District South - We would like to see the road between Joseph and Elsinore stay open to both street legal and OHV'S. Loa - District North - Most of the roads we would like to see stay open for street legal vehicles are ones that are rocky and erosion should not be a problem. We need to keep the road to Round Lake open from the top of Thousand Lake. The road that follows the ditch on Polk Creek needs to stay open, not only for the ranchers but also for the people who enjoy camping and hunting. The road out on Tubb Flat needs to remain open! The road on Billings needs to stay open! Both of these roads are rocky and are a great resource for those of us who enjoy camping, hiking and biking.
156	4	I	TRANS.4105 0	623	#157 from Barney Lake to Willow Springs via Anderson Canyon provides a good loop to Marysvale.
134	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Put Pipeline Trail on map. Great ride off #01 Kingston Springs to McCardy Springs
125	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	811	The trail from Barney Lake to Willow Springs Trail needs to be kept open & signed. I have been coming to this area nearly 10 years, riding on your trails & hope you consider my recommendations.
136	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	For 3 or 4 years we have rode the Pipeline Trail. This trail goes from 01 to #73 Kingston Springs to McCardy Springs, please consider putting this on the ATV travel map.
141	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Pipeline Trail from Kingston Canyon through to trail #73 via McCardy Springs should be included on the travel system.
186	4	I	TRANS.4105 0	815	The trail along the clover beds is scenic during the spring and fall. I have hunted from this trail each fall. I enjoy the scenery. I see elk most every time I travel this trail. This would be a great in inconvenience to close this trail because a few people want to hike into this area to

164	4	RM	ATTMT.9999 9	2	The Horse Flat Trail in the mountains east of Kanosh is not a newly proposed trail, but an old road with a long history of use. As far as I have been able to find out, the original road was pioneered by the State Road while looking at possible routes for the freeway. For several years it was the only good road up onto the mountain. It was in good enough condition to be traveled by pickup trucks and other vehicles, even cattle trucks. It was widely known and used during much of the last half of the 1900's. Portions of the road were washed out in the floods of 1983, but were reopened to help fight the large fire of 1996, then the forest service pushed up large berms and made other obstacles to close the road. There are several reasons for reopening this road as an ATV trail. Travel on this route would create additional loops, thus lessening traffic on other trails and roads. Loops are also more desirable for guided rides and would benefit both the Fillmore and Richfield Jamborees, as well as other recreational riders. Hunters would also benefit from this improved access. An ATV trail in this location would also help with better access to the mountain for search and rescue, as well a firefighters. Bob Gardner, ranger for the Fillmore Ranger District, has agreed that the proposed trail is worthwhile. He said he plans to propose it at some point when it seems logical to do so. The reopening of the Horse Flat Trail seems like a great addition to our trail system and a logical move on the part of everyone involved. If a more accurate map is needed, a few members of our ATV club would be happy to GPS the route, with permission from the forest service to do
137	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Put Pipeline trail on map from 01 Kingston Springs to McCurdy Springs to #73.
114	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	650	Abe Hansen Docking Corral Trail off Hancock Road for hunting access and fun trail for ATV's/
124	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	915	The Pipeline Trail that goes from 01 to 73 Kingston Spring to McCurdy needs to be put on the map.
183	4	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 4: We ride this route during the summer and hunting seasons, we need to have this route open during the summer and hunting season. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
126	4	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	The Pipeline Trail between #01 and #73 to Kingston Springs and McCurdy Springs, I would hope will be kept open and put on the map.

186	5	I	TRANS.4105 0	811	The trails and road in Indian creek open early in the spring. It is a place where we have had several family reunions. We have ridden the trails into North creek and up Twitchell canyon numerous times the members of my family have enjoyed this for years. It would be a tragedy to close this area. To only be enjoyed by a few. The current though is that the area will be over used by ATV's but the ranger has not even done a study as to determine ATV use.
122	5	I	TRANS.4105 0	620	Loa District North5) Old road.
110	5	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	The trail down to Fish Creek shows being closed - this is a great place to access the creek for fishing & camping.
182	5	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 5: We ride this route during the summer months, we need to have this route open during the summer and hunting season. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG. Keep side
114	5	I	TRANS.4105 2	620	Gahew Spring to Tasha Spring is a spectacular trail for ATV's and a shame it's not open all the way to Daniels Pass, this would make a round trip back to the dead end road north of Hancock Road.
159	5	I	TRANS.4000 0	840	And why is it that in those areas, both the Gooseberry and Monroe Mountain one can ride extensively on forest roads, and on the Beaver Mountain, aside from the Big John's Flat section of the Piute Trail we are denied use of the roads?
184	5	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 5: Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG. Hunter & recreational access.
67	5	I	TRANS.4010 0	2	I have used green to encircle a trail I would like to see designated as motorized access. I think it is trail number 105. My concern of closing this trail is that it has been widely used for two or three years that I am aware of which will make acceptance of closure difficult as well as the beautiful scenic view that is offered this close to
165	5	I	ATTMT.9999 9	810	Attachment 1: Map showing roads on Fillmore R.D. requested to remain open to street legal vehicles.
183	5	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 5: We ride this route during the summer and hunting seasons, we need to have this route open during the summer and hunting season. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
151	5	I	TRANS.4105 0	815	Kimberly Area - trail over Tip Top (tr-214, xt-564) and into Trappers Pride area. This and other roads and trails in the Kimberly area are so beautiful especially in the fall. Not to mention the historic beauty of the

184	6	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 6: Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG. Hunter & recreational access.
182	6	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 6: We ride this route during the summer months, we need to have this route open during the summer and hunting season. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
114	6	I	TRANS.4105 0	660	Road going to south end of Fish Lake is now closed to ATV's. The road east of sewer lagoons to the lake should be open to ATV's to let us ride in there to fish with our grandchildren as this is one of the few places on the lake you can fish from the shore. ATV's would not damage the road like pickups do. At my age 69 plus, ATV's are the only way I can enjoy our beautiful mountains.
151	6	I	TRANS.4105 0	815	Richfield Area - trail south of Table Mountain north of Richfield overlooks Little Valley & Cottonwood. Old pioneer road/trail - scenic & historic.
165	6	I	ATTMT.9999 9	810	Attachment 2: Map showing roads on Loa R.D. requested to remain open to street legal vehicles.
183	6	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 6: We ride this route during the summer and hunting seasons, we need to have this route open during the summer and hunting season. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
153	7	RM	TRANS.4000 0	1	Here are some areas of concern. This in no way constitutes a complete list. These are just some trails that jumped out in the very limited time I had to look at the maps:
182	7	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 7: We ride this route during the summer months. We need to have this route open during the summer and hunting season. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
114	7	I	TRANS.4105 2	2	Trail by cabin should be open for fire access and is an alternate trail for Mytoge Road. Safer because of race track.
183	7	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 7: We ride this route during the summer and hunting seasons, we need to have this route open during the summer and hunting season. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
107	7	I	TRANS.4105 0	819	We also hope that permission will be given to open the trail by Quakie Haven along the fence, that is parallel the highway over to the Hancock turn off, this too for safety
184	7	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 7: Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG. Hunter & recreational access.

183	8	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 8: We ride this route during the summer and hunting seasons, we need to have this route open during the summer and hunting season. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
182	8	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 8: We ride this route during the summer months, we need to have this route open during the summer and hunting season. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
184	8	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 8: Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG. Hunter & recreational access.
153	8	RM	TRANS.4105 1	650	Salina Creek - Spur between Na Gah Flat and Rust Springs. West spur is a very important jump off point to access a prime hunting area. There is a small pond a short hike from here. The road appears to be in good shape and has little if any erosion problems. There is no compelling reason to close this road.
183	9	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 9: We ride this route during the summer and hunting seasons, we need to have this route open during the summer and hunting season. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
182	9	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 9: We ride this route during the summer months, we need to have this route open during the summer and hunting season. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
114	9	I	TRANS.4105 2	815	Trail 057 - off Hancock Road should be open - very scenic loop for ATV's.
184	9	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 9: Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG. Hunter & recreational access.
153	9	RM	TRANS.4105 1	650	Salina Creek - 1618 road off Hancock Flat rd. This is very important road to hunters in the area. Seasonal closing would be fine in the winter when access is nearly impossible anyway.
153	10	RM	TRANS.4105 1	650	Salina Creek - Connecting road to above. This is also important for game retrieval and hunting.
182	10	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 10: We ride this route during the summer months, we need to have this route open during the summer. Please change this route to OPEN
153	11	RM	TRANS.4105 0	600	Salina Creek - South of Fish Lake - There needs to be a route from the Mytoge Mt. Rd up to the south and east sides of Fishlake so property owners and others can access the lake. There is a great little camping/picnic area on the south east

182	11	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 11: We ride this route during the summer months, we need to have this route open during the summer and hunting season. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
182	12	I	TRANS.4105 0	600	Map attachment 12: We ride this route during the summer months. We need to have this route open during the summer and hunting season. Please change this route to OPEN YEARLONG.
153	12	RM	RECRE.521 00	620	Why not make the Doctor Creek Campground ATV accessible? That would be a great stop over for an extended ATV trip!
153	13	RM	TRANS.4105 0	740	Salina Creek - On way to Gooseberry from I- 15. It appears you are cutting off access to a private road by closing
153	14	RM	TRANS.4105 0	620	Salina Creek - Beaver Dams - This is a very popular route and needs to be reconsidered. Perhaps we need to re-route the trail somehow.
153	16	RM	TRANS.4000 0	740	Salina Creek - Daniels Canyon - It appears you are closing off access to private property on the Boobie Hole mt Or is it BLM
153	17	RM	TRANS.4105 1	2	Salina Creek - Fishlake Hightop - Gahew Spr. Here is a perfect example of a road closure without a purpose. The road continues to a beautiful look off. There is absolutely no chance for erosion. No maintenance would ever need to be done, and yet the road is closed so no disabled person can drive out and enjoy the view!! The last time I was there, there was a HUGE road closed sign that absolutely ruined any scenic beauty of the area. When I asked the personnel at the forest service why it was closed, the answer I received was that it was a "compromise" with the environmentalists. Give me a break!
153	18	RM	TRANS.4105 2	623	Fillmore Dist. So. - Pioneer Peak - One of these trails needs to be open for motorized travel for a much needed loop route.
153	20	RM	TRANS.4105 2	815	Fillmore District South - North side of Cottonwood canyon. This is a must stay open trail! This is a very important pioneer trail that many of us have traveled for years and years. There is a spectacular look off as well as a very remote and exciting spur off the main trail.
153	21	RM	TRANS.4105 1	815	Fillmore District South - Devils Armchair - I would hate to see the very end of this road cut off. It's a long way to drive and not be able to see off the east side of the ridge!

153	22	RM	TRANS.4105 2	815	Fillmore District South - Cottonwood canyon-mouth - There are two old pioneer roads that go up to two different look offs. These should stay open, but the new trail N.E. of the old trash pile canyon could be
153	23	RM	TRANS.4105 0	680	Fillmore District South - CC Road - The first spur to the left between tire valley and little valley is a nice place to picnic or camp. Some of the extended trails from the camping spot could be closed.
153	24	RM	TRANS.4105 2	1	Fillmore District South - Willow Creek Canyon - The trail up the canyon is pretty much self limiting. In other words, the floods usually limit the access up the canyon a little ways. Why close it at the mouth? Let the motorized users ride up the canyon a little ways before they have to turn around and come back.
153	25	RM	TRANS.4110 0	1	MONROE MTN. - Twin Peaks/Forshea Mtn. It looks someone got a little carried away here. Most of the roads you are closing are important to many people or they wouldn't be there. Yes, you still left a corridor (seasonal) through it, but why do you need to close so much?

Public Concern Number 701

Public Concern Order 66

Public Concern The Forest Service should close or keep closed specific routes and/or areas to motorized use: a) because they were created illegally, b) to protect soils, c) to protect watersheds, d) to protect wildlife, e) to protect sensitive, threatened, and endangered plant and animal species, f) to protect roadless areas and potential wilderness, g) to be consistent with opportunities/restrictions on adjacent lands, h) to facilitate travel plan enforcement, i) to reduce maintenance costs and obligations and redundant routes, j) for public safety, k) because the route is revegetating and/or reclaimed.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
27	1	I	TRANS.4111 0	1	Long Flat/Baker Spring logging road needs to be closed.
26	1	I	ALTER.2352 0	1	We support the proposed action for the Shingle Creek/Fish Creek area on the Beaver Ranger District. (Shingle creek to Pine Creek Pass)

105	1	I	TRANS.4110 0	1	I am particularly pleased with the proposed plan pertaining to the trails #d 058, 060, 061, 062, 063, 064, 065, 086, 163, 222, 223, 231, etc., that they remain closed to motorized travel. I also support the local Ranger Mr. Dayle Flanigan on the proposed closing of approximately 82 miles of trails, roads, logging roads and etc.
149	1	I	TRANS.4110 0	620	I support your proposals of road closures on the Beaver Mountain. We need to get in control of the problem now, before it gets any bigger.
39	1	I	TRANS.4112 0	1	The only ATV trail I'm in favor of closing is the one through the scout camp at Strawberry.
34	1	I	TRANS.4112 0	1	I commend the Forest proposal to close the ATV trail from Shingle Creek to Fish Creek Pass and down the ridge past Butterfly Meadow.
32	1	I	TRANS.4111 0	2	Road junction at Johnson Reservoir going up to Gooseberry should be closed to ATV's - traffic congestion concerns, ATV's use in the basin concern, etc.
195	1	I	TRANS.4110 0	300	As per our phone conversation today I am sending you some maps with a couple of ATV trails that need to be closed. I have been bow hunting in this area for 25 years and I hate to see to trails pop up that damage the hillsides not to mention safety factors. The area of reference is the Fish Creek area near Sevier Canyon.(1) First trail of great concern is located at aprox. 3 8 degrees 28.216' N. 1 12 degrees 25.074' W. just off of the pipeline trail. The highlighted area on the map is pretty close to the actual location. This trail splits off the old pipeline trail and goes straight up the mountain. It is hazardous and eroding the side of this mountain. I know it is going to be tough to close because the persistence of the hunters who use that road but still needs to be closed.(2)Second trail is located 38 degrees 30.164'N 112 degrees 25.574' W. This trail is a new trail that cuts across and up and over the hillside. It is a continuation of a road that has been there for a long time but just like the first trail is going to cause some serious erosion. Just thought I would bring a couple of these to your attention. I have noticed the last couple of years some trails that have been closed and these are two that are worse than any of the others I have seen.

155	1	F	TRANS.4105 0	200	As currently proposed, the Polk Creek road would be a dead end route for ATVs at the park boundary, since Capitol Reef does not allow non-street legal vehicles on roads within the park. In an effort to avoid backtracking and to try to find a loop route, some operators will be tempted to cross-the park in violation of regulations and access a return route across BLM lands to the north. As an alternative, we recommend considering closing the Polk Creek road to ATVs at the Round Lake road turnoff west of the Capitol Reef National Park boundary. Permitting only street legal vehicles on this portion of the road would eliminate the dead end route and would help reduce potential enforcement issues on the park.
73	1	I	TRANS.4112 0	1	I am particularly pleased with the proposed plan relating to trails numbered 058, 060, 061, 063, 064, 086, 163, 222, 223, 231, and all others proposed in the plan to remain closed to motorized travel.
43	2	I	TRANS.4110 0	1	Monroe Mountain presents a major problem for the Forest. Because of its flat nature, off road use has become common place. One problem on "not so flat terrain" is there Signal Peak area. OHV use is beginning at Duck Lake and Annabella Reservoir and working its way up through the timber to the peak. This access to Signal Peak is obscure and unnoticed by enforcement personnel. It is, however, receiving a lot of use. I would like to see this area closed off and enforced.
26	2	I	TRANS.4110 0	819	We support closure of dangerous routes on Signal Peak and Grasshopper Mine and Trappers Creek.
101	3	I	TRANS.4110 0	300	The map is not very clear on where a road ends in T21S, R3W, Section35. The road in question heads west off of road 100 north of Turner Wash then ends at some point. I encourage you to have the road/trail end at the livestock pond or sooner. I have seen damage taking pace by those who are trying to force the trail further onto the
37	3	I	TRANS.4112 0	1	I strongly agree with the closing of the illegal Signal Peak Trails.
67	6	I	TRANS.4010 0	2	I have used red to encircle a trail I would suggest be closed to motorized. This is marked as trail number 622 and my concern here is that it is generally considered a high risk trail due to the sheer drop off to one side. Also this trail protrudes into an area that I feel is well suited for wilderness or at least non-motorized. Topology of this trail would provide for easy closure and easily manage this particular trail. While I have ridden this trail several times and enjoyed it, I have always been reluctant to suggest this trail to anyone because of its safety

161	7	P	TRANS.4110 0	2	Attachment photo 1: All photos in this location show routes installed for a project-specific purpose. In this case, they were used to facilitate the passage of bulldozers for livestock-focused vegetation manipulation. None of these routes show signs of either mechanical construction or maintenance. They are all in various stages of natural re-vegetation. NFMA requires that vegetation be re-established on all routes installed for a project specific purpose within five years of project completion. These routes, which serve no identifiable destination and rarely receive use, are now proposed as "open yearlong - no restrictions" by the Fishlake NF. Photo 2 shows that a berm has been constructed to impede traffic at the route's point of origin, effectively closing the route. It is imprudent to designate routes as open that are currently either closed or re-vegetating, in compliance with NFMA. As the map below shows, unacceptably high road density would persist in this area under the Fishlake's proposed travel plan. The UFN recommends all these routes not be designated open. This strategy would involve very little management effort, as the routes are already recovering. Care must be taken forest-wide to avoid simply designating nearly every known route as "open" without justification, as the draft plan appears to advise. This method of route designation will likely create additional ORV management problems in the future. A decision to classify and add routes without detailed analysis would be counter to the legal obligations of the Fishlake NF.
161	9	P	TRANS.4110 0	2	Attachment photo 3: This route is clearly not passable by non-four-wheel drive standard passenger vehicles. It is re-vegetating in the first photo, and eroding rapidly where vegetation has been removed due to the passage of vehicles in the second photo. The route serves no purpose or destination, and appears to be contributing to resource damage. The Fishlake NF proposed travel plan would designate this route "open year round - no restrictions." The UFN recommends this route for closure and rehabilitation as ample access and recreation routes exist in the area.

161	10	P	TRANS.4110 0	300	Unquestionably, this route is impassable to standard passenger vehicles. Resource damage is occurring at this site. The streambed is visibly widened at the vehicle ford, and the stream bank eroded by the passage of vehicles. Fine sediment easily disturbed by vehicles is also visible in this photo. ATVs have created a cutout around the full size vehicle ford further contributing to erosion and bank destabilization. Not only is this route not an acceptable Roadless Area boundary, it should be permanently closed to protect the aquatic resource, and the damage repaired.
161	11	P	TRANS.4110 0	2	Attachment photo 5: The photos above show a route installed for a specific purpose, in this case a timber sale, that has not been decommissioned in compliance with NFMA. Clearly the sale occurred longer than five years ago, and vegetative cover has not been re-established. A barrier, shown in photo 3, has been severed, and users have created a cutout, shown in photo 4, around this unlocked gate. There is currently no barrier to traffic on the western point of origin, as shown in photo 1. The route currently serves no purpose or destination, offers little or no challenge for motorized recreationists, and is leading to erosion, as shown in photo 2. The Fishlake NF route designation plan recommends this route be opened to all users with no restrictions. The UFN proposes this route, as well as others like it, be closed, re-contoured, and re-vegetated.
161	12	P	TRANS.4110 0	300	Attachment photo 6: A classic example of resource damage and duplication, this user-created ATV trail presents a hazard to both users and soils. This trail serves the same general area as two other ATV trails, and is not part of either the Paiute or GWT systems. Deep rutting is evident at the top of the trail, as shown in photo 2. The bottom of the trail is shown in photo 1 as it leaves a capped drill hole. It is steep, rocky, and dangerous to the inexperienced ORV user. The trail negatively affects hydrology in an area already heavily impacted by livestock grazing. The UFN proposes this trail for closure and rehabilitation. The Fishlake NF proposes this trail be designated "open yearlong - no restrictions."

161	13	P	TRANS.4020 0	2	Attachment photo 7: This segment of the Great Western Trail is officially signed in photo 1 as a "foot and horse route." As is evident in both photos, both ORVs and full-size vehicles use the route. Though proposed for closure under the Fishlake travel designation plan, the FS proposal fails to close the bulk of this so-called "foot and horse route" to vehicles. At a minimum, the route to the north of the segment proposed for closure should be accessed via vehicle by permittees only. The route serves a culinary water development and pipeline, and as such, presents a homeland security risk if unrestricted access is allowed to continue.
161	15	P	TRANS.4110 0	2	Attachment photo 9: This ATV trail through a clear cut invites the spread of noxious and invasive plant species in an area previously disturbed by timber activity. It is proposed as "open yearlong - no restrictions" under the Fishlake route designation plan. Past Bull Run Flat, the trail is proposed for seasonal closure. This situation creates a management nightmare, as there is no access to the seasonal closure for law enforcement in full size vehicles. Due to its remoteness, and the fragile nature of the terrain, the trail should be closed to motorized use from beginning to end. There are ample opportunities for motorized recreation in the same general area.
161	19	P	TRANS.4100 0	300	Attachment photo 13: This ATV trail, shown during rainfall, dramatically illustrates hydrological alteration caused by ORVs. The trail, devoid of vegetation, has become a watercourse, speeding runoff, enhancing erosion and soil loss, and diverting moisture from plant species. Trails such as this, where resource damage is evident should be stabilized or closed and re-vegetated.
161	20	P	TRANS.4110 0	300	Attachment photo 14: The route above is another example of the devastating effect roads have on the hydrological cycle. Erosion in fragile soils is a key reason the transportation system should be designed as a minimum acceptable network necessary for access and management. In its current form, the Fishlake proposed motorized travel plan fails miserably on this count. The Fishlake as proposes this route "open seasonally." The UFN recommends closure and rehabilitation of this route. The route above also highlights the effects under-funded budgets and maintenance backlogs have on the terrestrial resource

161	21	P	TRANS.4110 0	300	Attachment photo 15: As shown above, unplanned recreation often leads to riparian damage. Riders ford the stream, leading to bank erosion, channel destabilization, possible fuel and oil contamination of the waterway, and the spread of whirling disease and other parasites that hitch a ride on ORVs. The Fishlake proposes this trail be "open year long - no restrictions." The trail above should be closed to motorized use. Failing that, trails such as this should only be opened as waterways are bridged and riparian damage mitigated.
161	22	P	TRANS.4110 0	300	Attachment photo 16: The photos above show damage to a wet meadow. Users practice trail braiding, continually seeking drier routes across the meadow, leading to increased damage to sensitive environments. This route is classed as "open year round - no restrictions" by the Fishlake motorized travel plan. The UFN recommends closure and rehabilitation of this and similar routes. We are puzzled about what method of fieldwork or decision process that went into proposing this and similar routes. Even ORV users would recognize that damage is occurring here.
161	23	P	TRANS.4110 0	330	Attachment photo 17: As in location 16, this route shows braiding and damage to soils. Routes such as this promote an unacceptable level of resource damage, and should be closed and rehabilitated. The Fishlake motorized travel plan proposes this route be designated "open year long - no restrictions".
161	24	P	TRANS.4110 0	2	Attachment photo 18: A poster child for riparian injury, this ATV trail up Fish Creek Canyon is a prime candidate for immediate closure to motorized travel. The trail is currently closed by signage at an arbitrary location, after fording the stream more than a dozen times. On the day I was there, numerous users had violated the closure. Another ORVer in the field also told me: "you can still get in from the top side." Trails such as this that lead to increased sedimentation, pollution of aquatic environments and resource degradation are indefensible. This trail should be closed to all motorized use at its point of origin at the junction with the Paiute trail. Alarmingly, the Fishlake travel plan proposal maintains the status quo, designating this damaging trail "open year long - no restrictions".

161	25	P	TRANS.4070 0	510	Attachment photo 19: These routes, proposed for designation by the Fishlake travel plan as "open year long - no restrictions" simply no longer exist on the ground. No reasonable individual would consider these routes essential to access or forest management. Most users on the ground would have a difficult time even locating the route shown in photo 1. In fact, a sportsman's group has signed the route shown in photo 1 "closed" to protect habitat for wild turkeys. In this process, it important to begin with a blank map, then add routes that are truly needed and justifiable, instead of starting the process with nearly every mapped, aerially interpreted, and anecdotal route simply proposed as "open year long - no restrictions."
161	26	P	TRANS.4110 0	2	Attachment photo 20: This route, originally installed to facilitate contour trenching, has outlived its purpose and usefulness. The Fishlake travel plan proposes this route "open year long - no restrictions." This route serves no definable destination and should be closed to motorized use.
173	79	P	TRANS.4110 0	510	Attachment photo 1: UTM 41;3849 4260435Photo 1105. Looking west at dead end spur off FR 068. No sign of use. Almost completely revegetated. There is no evident public purpose for this route.
173	80	P	TRANS.4110 0	2	Attachment photo 2: UTM 413849 4260435Photo 1106. Looking east at a route parallel to FR 069. There is an old non-functioning well about 100 m from the photo location. A broken, non-functioning water line leads to the east from the well. It is broken into hundreds of pieces. The route is not traveled. The route no longer serves a purpose. The west end is fairly faint. The route is redundant. There is no sign of camp sites until you reach the east end at the junction with FR 069.Photo 1107. UTM 415123 4260266Looking west along route above. No sign of use.
173	81	P	TRANS.4110 0	510	Attachment photo 3: UTM 413205 4260943 Photo 1109. This is a short cut across a bend in the road never. It is still proposed for addition to the transportation system. The entire route serves no purpose. A short spur leading from TR 085 to FR 078 is eroding into a riparian zone. The proposed route in this area is revegetating.

173	82	P	TRANS.4000 0	510	Attachment photo 4: UTM 412502 4260088Photo 1118. Looking north at a proposed route. The route parallels the main road which is in the upper right of this photo just below the tree line. The trail descends from a dispersed camp site to a stock pond. It then climbs a hill and disappears in the sagebrush. There is braiding as the trail ascends the slope. On the north end this route follows a fence. This is a gentle swale with a seasonal moist meadow. The slope in the foreground is eroding. There are numerous shotgun shells and clay pigeon fragments along slope.
173	83	P	TRANS.4000 0	340	Attachment Photo 5: UTM 412649 4259139Photo 1122. User created route eroding into Upper Box Creek Reservoir. It is used as loop with the proposed addition to the transportation system. Campers are using a proposed new system road to camp on the shore of Upper Box Creek Reservoir increasing the probability of pollution and sedimentation. This route is not proposed for addition to the transportation plan. It demonstrates the problems associated with ATV use.
173	86	P	TRANS.4110 0	2	Attachment photo 8: UTM 411130 4257417 Photo 1166. End of proposed route. It leads to a fenced way down to Box Creek as shown in photos 1164 and 1165. The route descending to Box Creek is a safety hazard. This is just an access to a fence line. The entire route should be closed. There is no need for a route to repair the fence since the terrain is level. This route can only lead to problems.
173	88	P	TRANS.4110 0	2	Attachment photo 10: UTM 410493 4256871Photo 1177. This is the junction of a proposed route with Trail 225. It is limiting the re-growth of aspens. This area had aspen saplings 8 to 10 feet high. The route parallels the main road a short distance away. It is redundant and serves no purpose. There is no dispersed camping along it. We saw a herd of about 50 elk a few feet from here. There is evidence of browse but aspen saplings are reaching heights sufficient to reach maturity.
173	89	P	TRANS.4110 0	2	Attachment photo 11: UTM 410490 4253552Photo 1193. Looking NE, this is actually a system road off of FR 068. It is revegetating and shows no signs of use even though there were campers and ATV riders in the area. The transportation system already has excessive routes that are not used. The old ruts are still eroding.

173	90	P	TRANS.4110 0	2	Attachment photo 12: UTM 410810 4254602Photo 1200. There is a stock pond at the end of the route (Six Patch Draw). The route is unused, does not lead to any recreational use. The terrain is gentle and no road is needed to access the stock pond. The pond is no more than 300m from the road. There is no purpose for adding this route to the transportation system. There is some erosion near the stock pond.
173	91	P	TRANS.4110 0	510	Attachment photo 12: UTM 410853 4264672Photo 02. The route is completely revegetated. No sign of use in years. There can be no justification for adding this route to the transportation system.
173	92	P	TRANS.4110 0	510	Attachment photo 13: UTM 405071 4267999Photo 19. Another completely unused and revegetated route proposed for addition to the transportation system. The public does not appear to have found a purpose for this route.
173	93	P	TRANS.4110 0	510	Attachment photo 14: UTM 415800 4262954Photo 20. No sign of recent use. Shows little evidence of any use. Poor drainage could lead to deep rutting, increased maintenance costs. This shows that the routes have not been constructed or designed to prevent undue degradation of the resource.
173	94	P	TRANS.4000 0	510	Attachment photo 15: UTM 416602 4261716Photo 26. Looking SE. There is very little use. Route has rutting and active erosion. This is another route not designed or constructed to prevent degradation to the resource.
173	95	P	TRANS.4110 0	510	Attachment photo 16: UTM 415372 4262647Photo 33. Looking E. Junction of proposed spur route with main road. Very little sign of use. Some ATV tracks extend beyond the end on the map going out to a view over the rim. There are a large number of legal and legitimate viewpoints in the area. This route does not meet the criteria for addition to the Forest
173	96	P	TRANS.4110 0	510	Attachment photo 17: UTM 4153118 4262075Photo DT 38. Looking SE. Little sign of use. Standing water could be one of innumerable small stock ponds found on Monroe Mountain. There does not appear to be any destination or use for this route.
173	97	P	TRANS.4030 0	620	Attachment photo 18: UTM 415311 4261848Photo DT 39. Looking SE. End of proposed spur route. Some users are going beyond the end of the proposed route. Placing the route on the travel map will compound off route travel in this easy

173	98	P	TRANS.4110 0	510	Attachment photo 19: UTM 415980 4265312Photo DT 41. Looking E. This is just an old, unused fence line route. There is no evident purpose or need for this route. Maintenance of the fence does not require a public road.
173	99	P	TRANS.4110 0	300	Attachment photo 20: UTM 416025 4277622Photo MC 13. Looking NW. Proposed route climbs straight up a slope with deep ruts and erosion. This should be closed and rehabilitated. This is another example of route proposed for addition to the Travel Plan that is not constructed to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation to the resource.
173	100	P	TRANS.4110 0	2	Attachment photo 21: UTM 418311 4276719Photo MC 18. Looking E. North Spur. Travel here would have vegetation impacts. No sign of recent use here. The area is revegetating. There is no evident public purpose or need for this route.

Public Concern Number 801

Public Concern Order 67

Public Concern The Forest Service should open or keep open specific trails and/or areas to non-motorized use: a) to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities.

Issue Number

<i>Ltr#</i>	<i>Cmnt#</i>	<i>OrgType</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Comment</i>
33	2	I	TRANS.4105 2	1	Winkle Bob Trail from Thompson Basin Road to Thompson Creek is a horse trail. Backcountry Horsemen would like this kept open for foot and horse use. Non-motorized trail.
101	2	I	TRANS.4010 0	1	I encourage you to keep the trail in T25S, R3E, Sections 9, 16 non-motorized (trail starts on main road/campsites then heads east then north).
46	10	P	NRMGT.302 00	630	While you will receive significant pressure from motorized users, ending motorized use on trails currently designated non-motorized is simply solving a problem that is out of control on the Fishlake. It's not a legitimate "loss" for motorized recreationists, as their use was not sanctioned or legitimate in the first place.

APPENDIX A

Mail Handling and Coding Procedures and Explanations

Fish Lake NF OHV Route Designation Project - NOI Letter Attribution Codes

Header Order: MID, OT, S, and RT fields are required. IA, UT, LG, F, CIC, RI, and CE fields are used only where necessary. The TS (Total Signatures) field will tally automatically in Oracle. A stamp containing these fields will be placed on the working copy.

Data Entry will fill in the MID field. Coders will identify organization type, number of signatures, response type and delivery type on all letters and fill in the proper box. Use CIC (Common Interest Class) and UT (User Type) fields only if this information is requested by the client. Fill in additional fields when appropriate.

OT	S	RT	DT	IA	UT	LG	F	CIC	RI	CE	TS	

MID FIELD - Mail Identification – required

MID is a unique respondent number assigned in the CAT Oracle Program. The Oracle form contains mailing information needed to create mailing labels and also is needed to obtain project specific demographic information about a respondent.

OT FIELD - Organization Type - required

The *Organization Type* code identifies a specific type of organization, association, agency, elected official or individual. A response is assigned an organization type other than Individual ONLY if the respondent is speaking on behalf of the organization, NOT if they are merely members or employees of the organization. Generally these respondents will show their title with their name, such as president, director, field representative, or other official title. When in doubt, you may check either by telephone call to the organization or by searching the Internet for the names of organization representatives.

Employees of governmental agencies or organizations are usually determined to be speaking on behalf of the agency or organization if the submission is on official letterhead or is sent from a government email address. Elected officials may sometimes submit comments on plain paper, from a personal email, or even sign a form letter; but if they identify themselves as elected officials, they are still given the org type codes appropriate for the level of government for which they are officials. The following are standard organization type codes, other codes may be included if needed on a specific project.

Standard Organization Types:

Government Agency/Elected Officials

Code	Description
F	Federal Agency/Elected Official
N	International Government/Association
S	State Government Agency/Elected Official/Association
C	County Government Agency/Elected Official/Association
T	Town/City Government Agency/Elected Official/Association
Q	Tribal Government/Elected Official/Agency
XX	Regional/other governmental agency (multi-jurisdictional)

Interest Group (includes legal representatives of or lobbyists for interest groups)

A	Agriculture Industry or Associations (Farm Bureau)
B	Business, [affected business] (someone speaking for or as a business owner, chamber of commerce)
D	Place Based Group (homeowner's associations, planning cooperatives, i.e. Quincy Library Group)
E	Government Employee/Union
G	Domestic Livestock Industry (incl. permittees)
H	Consultants/legal representatives
I	Individual (unaffiliated, unknown or unidentifiable)
J	Civic Group (Kiwanis, Elks, Community Councils)
K	Special Use Permittee (Rec. homes, Backcountry huts, Outfitter/Guides)
L	Timber or Wood Products Industry or Associations
M	Mining Industry/Association (locatable)
O	Oil, Natural Gas, Coal, or Pipeline Industry (leasable)
P	Preservation/Conservation
R	Recreational (non-specific)
U	Utility Group (water, electrical, gas)
V	Professional Society
W	Academic (professor, research scientist, university department)
X	Conservation District
Y	Other or unidentified Organization

- Z Multiple Use or Land Rights Organization
- AE Agency Employee (analyzed separately)
- AR Animal Rights (humane treatment org)
- CH Church/Religious Group
- PI Public Interest Group/Political Party
- LO Private Land Inholding Owner
- QQ Tribal Non-Governmental Organization/Tribal Member
- RB Mechanized Recreation (bicycling)
- RC Recreation/Conservation Organization (Trout Unlimited, Elk Foundation)
- RM Motorized Recreation (4X4, OHV, snowmobiling)
- RN Non-Motorized/Non-Mechanized Recreation (hiking, x-c ski, horse/stock animals)

Notes on Organization Type Identification:

Letters from businesses are categorized as “B” only if you believe or they assert they are impacted by the decision, otherwise they are considered to be individual responses. A letter from a member of an organization is considered to be an individual response unless the author is representing the organization in an official capacity.

Letters from government employees submitted as personal are categorized as “I” rather than as codes F, N, S, C, T Q, which are reserved for official comments from an elected official or government agency or department. Letters from government employees submitted on government letterhead or via government email are considered to be internal comment, and are separated from public comment and analyzed separately.

S FIELD - Signatures - required

To determine the number of *Signatures*, look first at the signature itself. If the correspondence is signed *John Doe*, but the return address says John and Jane Doe, count it as one signature, because it was signed by one person. If the return address says John Doe, but is signed by *John and Jane Doe*, or *Mr. and Mrs. Doe*, count it as two signatures. If no signature is present or response is anonymous, count it as one. If signed *John Doe and Family*, count it as one.

RT FIELD - Response Type - required

The *Response Type* identifies the specific format of the correspondence.

Code	Description
1	Letter
2	Form or Letter Generator
3	Resolution
4	Action Alert
5	Transcript (dictated audio, video or telephone response)

Optional RT codes (Project Specific)

6	Public Meeting Comment Form
7	Public Meeting Transcript (hearing/oral testimony)
8	Public meeting/workshop group notes
9	Workshop notes (other than at Public Mtgs)
10	Petition

DT FIELD - Delivery Type – required

The *Delivery Type* is the method by which the response was transmitted by the respondent.

Code	Description
E	Email
F	FAX
H	Hand-delivered or oral testimony (personally delivered)
M	US Mail or commercial carrier (UPS, FedEx)
T	Telephone
W	Web-based submission
U	Unknown

IA FIELD - Early Attention - Red Flags (place on LEFT side of copy)

Early Attention codes are applied only to those documents requiring an immediate response from the team. The Early Attention codes are listed in order of priority. If more than one code applies to a single document, the code with the highest priority is attached. For example, if a State

Congressman threatens bodily harm to a Forest Service representative, the letter would receive a “1” instead of a “6”. A red flag is attached to the left side of the page with the IA code written on it.

<i>Code</i>	<i>Description</i>
1	Threat of harm
2	Notice of appeal or litigation
3	Freedom of Information Act request (FOIA)
4	Provides proposals for new alternatives
5	Requires detailed review or other follow-up
6	Government entities
7	Requests public hearing

Optional IA codes (Project Specific)

5a	Provides extensive technical edits – deletions/replacements
5m	Map(s) attached
6a	Requests cooperating agency status

UT FIELD - User Type

This is an optional project specific code. User types vary depending on the project or client needs. A *User Type* code may define the purpose for which an individual, organization, or agency uses public lands. User type is also often used to identify to which unit a comment or letter is submitted in multi-unit projects. Examples:

LG FIELD - Letter Generator

A *Letter Generator* is a response that enables respondents to extract specific text from a selection of prewritten comments. These responses are usually created through an interactive website that offers a selection of comments and allows the respondent to choose which paragraphs to include in their personal letter. Assign a consecutive LG number to these responses. Enter this number.

F FIELD - Forms (Organized Response Campaigns)

Forms or organized response campaign responses are identified when the mail processor receives 5 or more responses with identical text from different (unaffiliated) respondents. Enter the form number assigned by the team.

RI FIELD - Requests for Information - Blue flag (place on LEFT side of copy)

Requests for Information codes are applied only to those responses with specific requests for information pertaining to the proposal. The client determines the level of specificity for identifying information requests. A blue flag is attached to the left side of the page with the IR code written on it.

Code Description

- A Mailing list only or nothing to code (*do not attach a flag*)
- B Request to be removed from mailing list (*do not attach a flag*)
- C Request copy of Federal Register Notice
- D Other request for specific information
- E Request for confirmation of receipt of letter

Optional RI codes (project specific)

- F Request for hard copy of summary of the DEIS
- G Request for full hard copy of DEIS
- H Request for full CD version of DEIS
- I Request for hard copy of summary of FEIS
- J Request for full hard copy of FEIS
- K Request for CD version of FEIS
- L Request for draft copy of proposed rule/policy
- M Request for final copy of rule/policy
- Ch Request for hard copy of Fed Register Notice of the Proposed Rule
- Cd Request for CD of Fed Register Notice of Proposed Rule
- Ce Request for electronic copy of Fed Register of Proposed Rule

CE FIELD - Comment Extension - Yellow Flag (place on LEFT side of copy)

Comment Extension codes are used when a respondent has a specific request for extending the comment period.

<i>Code</i>	<i>Description</i>
0	No specific time mentioned or other
15	Request for 15 Day comment period extension
30	Request for 30 Day comment period extension
45	Request for 45 Day comment period extension
60	Request for 60 Day comment period extension
90	Request for 90 Day comment period extension
120	Request for 120 Day comment period extension

TS FIELD - Total Signatures

The Oracle automated field totals all signatures for all MIDs assigned to a response. Do not enter any codes here.

**FISHLAKE NF OHV ROUTE DESIGNATION PROJECT - NOI
ACTION CODES**

ALTER 20000-24999

- 20000 – Purpose and Need for Proposed Action
- 20100 – Need for an EA, EIS

- 21000 – Document General (NOI, DEIS, Plan)
- 21100 – Scope, Issues that should/should not be addressed

- 21200 – Technical and Editorial (spelling, grammar, clarity, consistency)

- 22200 – Desired Conditions
- 22300 – Goals
- 22400 – Objectives
- 22500 – Standards and Guidelines

- 23000 – Alternatives General
- 23100 – Alternative Development/Method/Range
- 23300 – Alternatives Developed By Others
- 23400 – Suggestion for New Alternative
- 23500 – Specific Alternatives Evaluated
- 23510 – Alternative 1 – Existing Plan and Route Designations (No Change)
- 23520 – Alternative 2 – Proposed Plan and Route Designations
- 23530 – Alternative 3 – Modified Plan and Route Designations

Natural Resources Management

- NRMGT 30000-39999**
- 30000 – Area Management General/Multiple (incl. general eco/enviro/resources. (Protect, Save, Don't Destroy, etc. when lacking a more specific mgmt. recommendation)

- 30100 – Monitoring, Inventories, Mapping, GIS

- 30200 – Enforcement (Includes illegal activities on NFS land)
- 30300 – Analysis (specific resources)
 - 30310 – Cumulative Effects
 - 30320 – Combined Effects

- 31000 – Physical Elements
 - 31100 – Water/Watershed Management

Processes

PRCSS 10000-19999

- 10000 – Decision making process and methods

- 10100 – Role/Authority

- 10200 – Coordination and Consultation with Other Agencies
- 10300 – Coordination and Consultation with Tribes

- 11000 – Decision making Philosophy (*How*, not *what*, to decide)
 - 11100 – Multiple Use Management Emphasis
 - 11200 – Ecosystems Management Emphasis
 - 11300 – Preservation (Hands Off Management)
 - 11400 – Adaptive Management Emphasis
 - 11500 – Use of Public Comment (Vote, Majority, Forms)

- 12000 – Public Involvement
 - 12100 – Agency Communication
 - 12110 – Adequacy/Availability of Information
 - 12120 – Public Meetings/Hearings
 - 12130 – Outreach/Education
 - 12140 – Collaboration
 - 12200 – Adequacy of Comment Period
 - 12300 – Adequacy of Entire Timeframe

- 13000 – Use of Science; Best Avail. Science
 - 13100 – Adequacy of Analysis (General, Multiple)

- 14000 – Agency Organization, Funding and Staffing
 - 14100 – Funding, General
 - 14120 – Funding to Implement Travel Plan
 - 14200 – Staffing General
 - 14210 – Staff Training, Education
 - 14220 – Volunteers

Alternatives and EIS

- 31120 – Buffers, Riparian, Wetlands
- 31130 – Dams and river/stream flow
- 31200 – Soils Management
- 31210 – Slope Stability Design
- 31220 – Erosion Control
- 31230 – Soil Compaction
- 32000 – Biological Elements
- 32100 – Species Viability Assessment
- 32200 – Wildlife/Animals Management
- 32210 – Breeding Programs, Stocking, Reintroductions
- 32220 – Harvest Levels and Methods
- 32230 – Wildlife Structures (ponds, waterholes, barriers)
- 32300 – Vegetation Management
- 32310 – Active Treatment Methods (other than fire and fuels)
 - 32311 – Pesticides and Herbicides
 - 32312 – Cultivation
 - 32313 – Maintenance
- 33000 – Fire and Fuels Management
- 33100 – Wildland Fires General
- 33200 – Role of Fire in Ecosystems
- 33300 – Unit Fire Plans
- 33400 – Fuels Reduction
 - 33410 – Prescribed Fire
 - 33420 – Mechanical Thinning
 - 33500 – Smoke Management
- 34000 – Timber Resource Management
- 34100 – Suitability Determinations
- 34200 – Allowable Sale Quantity (ASQ)
- 34300 – Harvest Levels (Actual)
- 34400 – Harvest Methods
- 34500 – Restoration, Salvage Logging
- 34600 – Firewood
- 34700 – Christmas Trees
- 34800 – Alternatives to Wood Products
- 35000 – Domestic Livestock Management
- 35100 – Grazing Management
- 35200 – Fences and other structures
- 36000 – Mining and Mineral Exploration
- 36100 – Locatable (minerals, metals)
- 36200 – Leasable (oil, gas)
- 36300 – Processes, Methods, Waste Treatment/Disposal
- 36400 – Land Restoration, Reclamation, Bonding
- 37000 – Other Activities Mgmt (Multiple, Special Uses, Infrastructure, Utilities, etc.)
 - 37010 – Permitting (except recreation permits)
 - 37020 – Valid Existing Rights
 - 37030 – Subsidies, Commodity Valuations, or Valuation Methods
 - 37100 – Special Forest Products Collection (mushrooms, berries, pine nuts, etc.)
 - 37200 – Heritage Resources Management
 - 37300 – Communication Sites and Facilities
 - 37400 – Utility Corridors
 - 37500 – Alternative Energy Sources, Hydroelectric Development
 - 37600 – Research
 - 37610 – Facilities
 - 37620 – Projects
 - 37700 – Military Operations
- Transportation System Management**
- TRANS 4000-44999**
- 40000 – Transportation System Mgmt General (and general access, multiple or if no other topic specified)
 - 40100 – Changes in Route (road or trail) Type (motorized to non-motorized, or vice versa/ road to trail, or vice versa)
 - 40200 – Changes in Route (road or trail) Classification
 - 40300 – Motorized Cross-Country Travel (off-trail and off-road)
 - 40310 – Exemptions (for going off-road or trail)
 - 40320 – OHV Managed Use Areas (play areas)
 - 40400 – Closed unless posted open/ vice versa
 - 40500 – Seasonal Restrictions/Closures
 - 40600 – Rights-Of-Way
 - 40700 – Roads Analysis (Designations, Mapping, Inventory)
 - 40800 – Construction General
 - 40810 – Roads
 - 40820 – Trails
 - 40900 – Reconstruction General
 - 40910 – Roads
 - 40920 – Trails
 - 41000 – Maintenance General
 - 41010 – Roads

- 41020 – Trails
- 41050 – Open/Remain Open General
 - 41051 – Roads
 - 41052 – Trails
- 41100 – Removal/Decommissioning/Close/Remain Closed General
 - 41110 – Roads
 - 41120 – Trails
- 41200 – Methods of Physical Closure General (Tank Traps, Gates, Boulders)
 - 41210 – Roads
 - 41220 – Trails
- 41300 – Non-System and User-Created General (NOT USED YET, 40200 SEEMS TO WORK BETTER)
 - 41310 – Roads
 - 41320 – Trails
- 41400 – Trans. Related Structures: Signs/Bridges/Culverts/Stream-crossings/Gates/Safety-barriers/Habitat Linkages/Etc.

Recreation Management

RECRE 50000-59999

- 50000 – Recreation Management, General/Multiple
- 50100 – Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (more of this type of rec., less of that, group size, etc.)
 - 50110 – Area Strategies General
- 50200 – Fee Demonstration Project/User Fees
- 50300 – Recreation Permitting
 - 50310 – Commercial
 - 50320 – Non-commercial
- 50400 – User Education, General/Multiple
 - 50410 – Access and Travel

Management education

- 52000 – Developed Recreation/Rec Facilities
- 52100 – Campgrounds/Picnic Areas
- 52200 – Launch Sites (Rafts, Kayaks, Canoes)

- 53000 – Dispersed Recreation Management
- 53100 – Motorized Recreation General
 - 53110 – Summer or Year-Round (ATV's, OHV's, Motorcycles, etc.)
 - 53111 – Jamborees
 - 53120 – Winter (snowmobiling, etc.)
- 53200 – Non-Motorized Recreation General
- 53300 – Mechanized Recreation (Bicycling)

Lands and Special Designations

LANDS 60000-69999

- 60000 – Public Land Ownership/Boundaries
- 61000 – Land Acquisition and Exchanges
 - 61100 – Appraisals and Valuation
- 62000 – Special Land Designations
 - 62100 – Roadless Areas
 - 62110 – Evaluation/Inventories
 - 62200 – Designated Wilderness
 - 62210 – Proposed, Recommendation, Study
 - 62300 – Research Natural Areas
 - 62400 – Wild and Scenic Rivers
 - 62500 – National Scenic Byways
 - 62600 – National Historic Trails
 - 62700 – National Historic Landmarks
 - 62800 – National Recreation Trails

Social and Economic

SOCEC 70000 – 79999

- 70000 – Social/Economic Actions or Activities

ATTMT – 99999

Site Specific

- ##### - Road/Trail Number; include periods and letters if provided (up to twelve digits; periods and letters are OK)
- R – Road, trail, or ways by name with no number found on table (includes ambiguous designations)
- M – Multiple roads, trails, or ways (not practical to separate)
- S – Site or area other than road or trail (watershed, drainage, wilderness, town, campsite, etc.)
- X – No reference to specific road/trail (default)

Optional 1

- 0 - None
- 1 – Alternative 1 (No Change)
- 2 – Alternative 2 (Preferred)
- 3 – Alternative 3 (Modified Preferred)
- 4 – Suggested New Alternative

**FISHLAKE NF OHV ROUTE DESIGNATION PROJECT - NOI
RATIONALE CODES**

- 001 – No affected Resource/Rationale
- 002 – Multiple Affected Resources/Rationales
(Envir, Rec, Socio, Econ)
- 010 – Persons and Groups
- 020 – Government
 - 021 – President/Executive Branch
 - 023 – Agency (Forest Service)
 - 025 – Other Federal Agencies
 - 027 – Legislative Branch (Congress)
 - 029 – Judicial Branch (Courts)
- 030 – State, County, and Municipal Governments
- 040 – American Indians/Tribes
- 050 – Interest Groups
 - 051 – Environmental Groups
 - 053 – Multiple Use/ Wise Use Groups
 - 055 – Recreation Groups
 - 057 – Industry/Business Groups (econ. issues to 900+)
 - 059 – Political Parties
- 060 – General Public
 - 061 – Local Citizens/Communities
 - 063 – Nationwide Citizens/Communities
- 100 – Laws, policies
 - 110 – Democracy
 - 120 – Federal, General/Multiple
 - 121 – Constitution
 - 123 – Federalism, States Rights
 - 125 – Individual Rights, Public Own Fed Lands
 - 127 – General Welfare, Public Good, Public Interest
 - 129 – Tribal Rights and Interests
 - 130 – Federal Laws
 - 131 – NEPA
 - 133 – NFMA
 - 134 – RS-2477
 - 135 – Endangered Species Act
 - 137 – Clean Air Act
 - 139 – Clean Water Act
 - 140 – Court decisions (past or pending)
- 150 – Tribal Treaties, Policies, Plans
- 160 – Agency Rules, Plans, Policies (Include OHV E.O.s as 160)
 - 161 – Appeals and Objections
 - 162 – Roadless Rule & Interim 1920
 - 163 – Relation to 1986 LRMP
 - 165 – National OHV Policy
 - 167 – National Fire Plan
- 170 – Rules, Plans, etc. of Other Federal Agencies
- 180 – Rules, Plans, etc. of States
- 190 – State, County or Municipal Laws, Policies, Etc.
- 200 – Interjurisdictional Consistency/Coordination
- 300 – Natural Environment, General/Multiple (national treasure, national heritage, pristine areas)
 - 301 – Environmental Quality and Ecosystem Integrity
 - 303 – Inherent worth of the environment
(apart from human benefits/use/enjoyment/need)
 - 305 – Forest Health
- 320 – Physical Elements, General/Multiple
 - 330 – Soils and Geology
 - 331 – SOIL (DISTURBANCE, EROSION, COMPACTION)
 - 333 – CAVE/KARST RESOURCES
 - 335 – MINERALS
 - 337 – Paleontological Resources
- 340 – Water Resources General
 - 341 – SURFACE WATER
 - 342 – GROUNDWATER
 - 343 – RIPARIAN AREAS AND WETLANDS
 - 344 – WATER QUANTITY
 - 345 – WATER QUALITY
 - 346 – WATERSHED CONDITION
- 350 – Air Quality
- 360 – Climate, Weather, and Atmospheric Processes
- 370 – Fire and Risk of Fire
 - 371 – Wildland Urban Interface
- 400 – Biological Elements General/Multiple Biological Resources
 - 410 – Biodiversity, Extinctions
 - 420 – GENETIC DIVERSITY
 - 430 – Ecosystem/Habitat Composition and Function
 - 431 – FRAGMENTATION, PERFORATION, AND CONNECTIVITY
 - 433 – Disturbance Regimes
 - 440 – Species of Special Concern General/Multiple (T&E, Sensitive)
 - 441 – Management Indicator Species
 - 450 – Wildlife General/Multiple
 - 451 – Avian Wildlife
 - 453 – Terrestrial Wildlife
 - 455 – Fisheries and Aquatic Wildlife

- 460 – Vegetation, General/Multiple
- 461 – Forest Structure/Vegetation
- 463 – Old Growth/Old Forest
- 465 – Clearings/Canopy openings
- 467 – Non-Forested/Rangeland Vegetation
- 469 – Fuel Wood
- 470 – Invasive species
- 471 – Noxious or non-native plants
- 473 – Insects/Pests
- 475 – Aquatic Nuisance Species

- 500 – Facilities, Infrastructure
- 510 – Transportation System General/Multiple
- 511 – Road Infrastructure/Condition
- 513 – Trail Infrastructure/Condition
- 515 – Road Density
- 520 – Communication Sites and Facilities
- 530 – Dams, Diversions, Hydroelectric Developments
- 540 – Utility Corridors
- 550 – Research and Educational Facilities

- 560 – Military Structures, Facilities, Operations

- 600 – Recreation: General/Multiple/Other
- 610 – User/Use Conflicts
- 620 – Motorized Recreation
- 621 – Play areas near communities
- 623 – Loop Routes
- 625 – Single Track
- 630 – Non-Motorized Recreation
- 631 – Equestrian/Pack Animals
- 633 – Boating, Swimming
- 635 – Skiing, Snowshoeing
- 640 – Mechanized Recreation
- 650 – Hunting/Shooting
- 660 – Fishing
- 670 – Antler Gathering
- 680 – Camping
- 690 – Future growth

- 700 – Lands
- 710 – Potential for Special Designation
- 720 – Other/Adjacent Federal Lands (parks, BLM, military)
- 730 – Adjacent State/County Lands
- 740 – Private Property/Inholdings

- 750 – Tribal Lands/Reservations
- 760 – Towns, Communities

- 800 – Social Conditions/Values General (Including Socio-Economic)
- 810 – Quality of Life (tradition, traditional way of life)
- 811 – Value to Individuals, Families, Seniors, Disabled, etc.
- 813 – Spiritual Values, Solitude
- 815 – Scenery, Visual Resources
- 817 – Noise
- 819 – Health and Safety
- 820 – Trust and Credibility
- 830 – Anthropological Heritage and Cultural Resources
- 840 – Equity, Justice
- 841 – Future Generations, Legacy Values
- 843 – Environmental Justice
- 845 – Class and Income Equity
- 847 – ADA Compliance
- 850 – International: Transfer of Effects or Role Model
- 860 – American Indian Values/Traditions
- 870 – Demographics
- 871 – Population, Community Structure and Stability
- 873 – Urbanization and Development

- 900 – Economic Conditions and Values, General/Multiple
- 910 – Economic Role of Agency-Administered Lands/Resources
- 911 – International
- 912 – US
- 913 – Tribal
- 914 – State/Regional
- 915 – Local/Employment/Jobs
- 916 – Property Values
- 917 – Tax Base and Payments to States, Counties, etc.
- 920 – Business Viability, Profits, Profit Motive
- 921 – Mining, Oil Companies
- 923 – Timber companies
- 925 – Livestock companies (ranchers)
- 927 – Outfitting/Guiding/Recreation Industry
- 930 – Net Public Benefit and Agency Accounting
- 931 – Non-Market Products/Services/Costs/Externalities
- 933 – Tax Dollars
- 935 – Agency Funding, Expenses, Forest Budget