

SB Comments on Alternatives

-----Original Message-----

From: Stephen Bonowski [mailto:nztrekker@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, July 04, 2005 2:56 PM
To: kparker@keystone.org; jeremy_Casterson@co.blm.gov
Cc: Reed Morris; luke@cecenviro.org; aoliver@tnc.org; smithv@cmc.org;
rhammel@cmn.net; Stephen Bonowski
Subject: Comments for Subcommittee Meetings

Hello. I've just reviewed and printed the preliminary "hot topics" document for the NWCOS subcommittee meetings on Wednesday and Thursday. While there has been a clear invitation for NWCOS participants to submit additional comments, there is also the statement on the document that "any comments submitted by NWCOS and approved by another person will be considered.....for inclusion." What is meant by the statement "approved by another person?" Who has to approve comments?

In any event, my request is for an indepth discussion of the travel management designations. As both a conservationist & recreationist, I am having REAL heartburn concerning the reluctance to move to a system of designated OHV routes as part of the RMP process. Retention of an "existing roads and trails system" perpetuates the damage that has occurred by the open designation given to the vast majority of the Resource Area acreage by uncontrolled OHV activity. I fully commend the agency for wanting to move from the "open" system. However, some existing OHV trails will be on ground that can sustain and handle the pounding; some trails will not be on such firm ground. Allowing use of said trails perpetuates and worsens already existing damage. Use of the "existing trails" mode also gives de facto approval to motorized recreationists to "blaze in new routes" while the going is good, so to speak.

Further, I hope to see an indepth discussion on the "certain criteria" that when triggered, will initiate the transportation management planning and change the designation to Limited to Designated Routes. Thus far, I don't believe those criteria have appeared in print anywhere. At least, they are not specifically listed that I can see in the May 18 draft alternatives. I continue to opine that transportation planning needs to be done sooner rather than later. The 3-5 year time frame following the Record of Decision, hopefully expected by 2008, that has been discussed to date extends the problem to as far out as 2013.

Thanks for your consideration.

Steve Bonowski