

Public Comment Summary

Issue Codes

1 Access

- a Disabled
- b Multiple use
- c Shared Use
- d Snowmobiles
- e Wheeled Oversnow Use

2 Administration

- a Compliance
- b Funding
- c Liability
- d Maintenance
- e Monitoring
- f Safety
- g Signing
- h Speed Limits
- i Volunteers

3 Economic

- a Local Economy

4 NEPA

- a Alternatives
- b Analysis
- c Maps

5 Private Property

- a Conflicts
- b Noise
- c Right of Way

6 Recreation

- a Camping
- b Noise
- c Non-motorized
- d User Conflicts

7 Resources

- a Air Quality
- b Fire
- c Global Warming
- d Heritage Resources
- e Invasive Species
- f Sensitive Plants
- g Soils
- h Vegetation
- i Visual Resource
- j Watershed
- i Wildlife

8 Routes

- a Add routes
- b Close routes
- c Decommission
- d Difficulty Rating
- e Minimum System
- f Road Density
- g Seasonal Closures
- h Vehicle Type

9 Special Uses

- a Concession
- b Events
- c Permits
- d Permittee

10 Special Areas

- a Roadless Areas
- b Wild and Scenic River
- c Wilderness
- d Yosemite

11 Travel Corridors

- a Big Game Retrieval
- b Camping
- c Cross-country Travel
- d Parking

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
1	080122-10-01	Access	Alternatives	Concession	Rather than assuming that OHV use must be accommodated in the National Forest, consider the value to our natural resource base of not allowing OHV access to public land. Also consider as an alternative the possibility of implementing a fee/concessionaire model where OHV use would be restricted to a small, specific area that would be leased to an operator who would have the responsibility for monitoring and restoring environmental damage created by OHV use.	2
2	071213-02-02	Access	Disabled		My wife has a state recognized disability and the only way that she is able to enjoy our mountains and campground in these remote areas is by getting there in a 4x4 vehicle.	5
3	071205-01-01	Access	Multiple Use	Add Routes	Multiple-Use for access to all users. Motorized trail systems must be expanded not limited to disperse users and minimize conflicts among all users. Motorized recreation opportunities must be expanded to accommodate the growing number of such users, who all are US citizens and taxpayers. If you are to limit area, it would be much more reasonable to limit the number of hiking trails/miles of trails, due to the slower mode of travel.	5
4	071212-04-01	Access	Shared Use	Non-motorized	We just learned that you had plans to change some of the route designations in the STF (including the Mattley & Corral Hollow OHV areas) to allow general non-motorized access to those OHV trails. We are concerned about lost motorized access as a result of this change.	1
5	071219-05-01	Access	Shared Use		It would be a real shame if for some reason this area (Mattley Loop trail) were to be allowed general non motorized access to these OHV trails. We have been getting more and more miles of trails deleted because of various excuses or misuses of our precious land.	1
6	071212-03-01	Access	Shared Use		I do not want any changes to the motorized travel plan. I do not want to share the trails for motorized vehicles with hikers, equestrians nor bicyclists. There are many other areas designated for the use of this type of activity.	5
7	071213-02-01	Access	Shared Use		It would be a real shame if for some reason this area (Mattley Loop trail) were to be allowed general non motorized access to these OHV trails.	5
8	080118-16-03	Access	Snowmobiles	User Conflicts	In winter motorized users equipped with over-snow vehicles have a record of disrupting cross-country ski trails by needlessly churning up the routes and disturbing the quiet peace of the forest. These are all reasons why designated roads must be kept to a bare minimum.	1
9	080117-12-06	Access	Snowmobiles		There are some proposals of Over Snow Vehicle use designations in this plan, as well as a contradictory discussion that over snow use will be covered in a separate process. If designations for over snow uses are to be made, they should be done in the context of a comprehensive Winter Recreation Plan and not put in this plan in a piecemeal and arbitrary fashion.	1
10	071212-02-01	Access	User Conflicts	Shared Use	As you may already know, over 1/3 of the trails are already exclusive to non-motorized access, and in some cases non-mechanized access, so it doesn't make sense to subject non-motorized users to a conflict of use in an area that has long been an area designated of OHV usage.	2
11	071213-04-01	Access	User Conflicts	Shared Use	I believe we can maintain a balance between motorized and non-motorized use of the NF and hope in the planning of the forest we can avoid multiple use of designated OHV routes. Many areas of the forest already been designated as wilderness or non-motorized use and I would hate to see the OHV routes diminished any further than they have been.	5
12	080114-03-04	Access	User Conflicts		Separate OHV use from residences, private property, wilderness and environmentally sensitive areas.	5
13	071213-02-03	Access	User Conflicts		We 4 wheelers are limited by designation in regards to trails, unlike non-motorized procreators. With over a third of all trails already being exclusive to non-motorized use and the fact that the people that are hikers, bicyclers, and horseback riders still use the motorized tail, makes it 100% for them and 66% for us.	5
14	071219-05-02	Access	User Conflicts		We 4 wheelers are limited by designation in regards to trails, unlike non-motorized users.	5
15	080102-07-02	Access	Vehicle Type	Liability	Current uncontrolled use of dirt bikes and quad's is not good for the forest, the environment, the roads, and especially the forest's private property neighbors". They often ride, in reckless manner on county roads where licensed, legally insured drivers also drive. This is a liability issue for the USFS.	5
16	080109-05-02	Access	Vehicle Type		All terrain vehicles should be licensed and restricted to public roadways and their own parks.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
17	080130-02-01	Access	Wheeled Oversnow Use	Seasonal Closures	Please keep open some forest service roads for over snow street legal vehicles. Hwy4 Please remove from list of winter closures as many as you can in the area of 7N09, and include Boards crossing/Sourgrass area.	5
18	080104-01-03	Administration	Add Routes	Maintenance	Why is the Forest considering adding over 125 miles of unauthorized routes to the current inventoried OHV routes? How does the Forest plan on managing and enforcing laws on these routes when the forest doesn't have enough resources for current roads.	6
19	080104-01-06	Administration	Compliance	Close Routes	Stanislaus Forest seems to believe that OHV users will follow all laws and be considerate of forest resources. These people may exist, but experience has shown me that OHV users are not following the law and that forest resources are being destroyed. Unauthorized routes should be closed and revegetated, additional law enforcement personnel should be hired, and OHV users who break laws should be fined.	
20	080118-11-01	Administration	Compliance	Decommission	Please work toward maintaining and patrolling OHV designated trails as previously established. To protect our forest and residents, it is imperative that you close and decommission unnecessary roads, avoiding more off trail damage.	1
21	071221-03-03	Administration	Compliance	Funding	I have a concern with excessive exhaust noise in the woods from OHVs. The law enforcement rules for noise and sparks are place. What is needed is funding for law enforcement to match the forest use by the public of OHV recreation before the activities are promoted.	1
22	080122-17-04	Administration	Compliance	Funding	USFS needs an increased budget to be able to enforce the restrictions, whatever they turn out to be.	1
23	080118-16-01	Administration	Compliance	Funding	My principal concern is that all roads should be kept to an absolute minimum. STF does not have the resources to monitor and patrol the roads now in use, so it makes sense to decommission some of the lightly-used current roads to reduce the burden.	1
24	080116-11-03	Administration	Compliance	Funding	The Forest Service must be careful not to allow more routes in the travel system than the agency has the staff and funding to monitor, manage, restore, AND enforce. One of the problems of off-road vehicle use has been precisely the lack of adequate monitoring, restoration of impacts, and enforcement of regulations. The agency must consider how THIS plan will facilitate those essential management actions.	5
25	080123-01-07	Administration	Compliance	Funding	I am also greatly concerned that the USFS will suffer inadequate budget and manpower to sufficiently manage all of these routes. Without serious enforcement OHVs will not deter from creating more routes or from removing signs and using closed routes.	
26	080104-03-01	Administration	Compliance	Funding	It is clear to me that there are currently way too many roads and trails that Forest Service can monitor and maintain. Without adequate supervision, the pattern of illegal OHV trail creation will continue unabated, leading to further degradation of wildlife habitat. Please consider moving in the direction of fewer roads and trails.	
27	080115-05-02	Administration	Compliance	Parking	Establish trail head starting points with designated parking areas. These starting points should have trail maps and regulations clearly posted. This will keep people from stopping just anywhere to start riding. It will also inform users of where they can and can't go. Structure the regulation so that parking is allowed in designated areas only and then ENFORCE the regulation. Publishing maps in the newspaper or making them available at the ranger stations will not be sufficient. The rules and maps must be clearly posted on-site and the trails marked at regular intervals in some way.	1
28	080122-27-07	Administration	Compliance	Private Property	The Forest Service does not have the resources to adequately police this area. The area is too small to keep users satisfied and user created trails will proliferate without adequate enforcement. The trails abut private lands and will encourage trespass without adequate patrolling.	
29	080122-28-07	Administration	Compliance	Private Property	The Forest Service does not have the resources to adequately police this area. The are is too small to keep users satisfied and user created trails will proliferate without adequate enforcement. The trails abut private lands and will encourage trespass without adequate patrolling.	
30	080118-02-04	Administration	Compliance	Signing	Educating the people and having NFS presence in the forest to deter and cite people is a better way. In our travels into the forest we rarely see NFS employees, the roads are a mess, signs are shot up and not replaced, and gates are falling down.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
31	080119-01-13	Administration	Compliance		Establish and inform of stringent enforcement measures, such as citations, fines, and impoundment to discourage the long-standing and rampant disregard of regulations and vandalism.	2
32	080115-03-02	Administration	Compliance	Monitoring	I will also be surprised if the FS has the manpower to monitor, let alone manage, these vehicles and the destruction they wreak on forest roads, foot paths, the forest ecosystem and the conservation efforts of more thoughtful protectors of our remaining wilderness.	5
33	080117-06-03	Administration	Compliance		Expanding motorized travel in the national forests and legitimizing unauthorized trails is a step backward. Limited law enforcement resources will be further diffused, and additional National Forest lands will be subjected to damage and erosion, with noise and air pollution covering a larger area.	5
34	080118-08-01	Administration	Compliance		If allowed at all, any roads/trails chosen for unlicensed OHV use should be in easily managed smaller acreage areas so law enforcement is practical and impacts are less dispersed and easier to inventory and maintain. The widely dispersed road and trail use in the Proposed Action, for unlicensed OHVs, is unmanageable and lead to unenforceable illegal off route use and uninventoried damage.	5
35	080122-24-01	Administration	Compliance		My preference would be that only law enforcement and U. S. Forest Service personnel had motorized access to many of these areas in case of emergency or situations requiring their presence, i.e. drug-growing operations, plane crashes and the like.	5
36	080114-04-01	Administration	Compliance		The plan as shown on your map is far too widespread to be enforced or maintained. I believe that confined riding areas of a reasonable size could be provided in locations where damage would have minimum impact, and where enforcement would be possible. These areas might occupy a few hundred acres each, rather than be spread out over hundreds of thousands of acres that can affect wildlife, watercourses, wilderness and other sensitive areas.	5
37	080117-05-01	Administration	Compliance		The only way to enforce the rules for these off-road bikers is to keep them in an area where they can be policed. In my neighborhood, they race down the street... illegally of course. On their way into the forest, where they tear up the walking trails- causing them to erode into streams, and scare the hell out of people as well as any wildlife that may be in the area.	5
38	080117-02-04	Administration	Compliance		The system you are proposing appears to have much of the same approach that has led over the years to widespread damage and disruption in the forest. If there is to be off-highway vehicle use in our forest, then it should be in confined areas that can be managed.	5
39	080117-12-03	Administration	Compliance		The Forest's motorized vehicle enforcement capabilities have been pathetic for many years. There has been almost no enforcement regulating current OHV use. This has resulted in widespread unauthorized use of OHVs in most areas of the Forest. For instance there has been regular off-road motorized use of the ridge top along Blood's Ridge on the west side of the village of Bear Valley for many years and no apparent ability of the Forest to control this unauthorized use. Creating a new set of maps and designations will not address this fundamental issue. What good is it to create a plan when the motorized users are going to go wherever they want anyway? Without a clear enforcement plan and commitment from the Forest to implement that plan, this proposal is irrelevant. This motorized vehicle plan must clearly demonstrate a feasible and functional enforcement plan that can handle the widespread use of Forest roads. If the Forest does not have the resources to adequately enforce off-road use over the whole of the Forest, then it should consider limiting off-road use to smaller and more manageable areas.	
40	080118-21-10	Administration	Compliance		Consolidate OHV trails in well-defined areas that can be effectively enforced.	
41	080122-21-03	Administration	Compliance		The plan to have a free-for-all open access for motors everywhere during hunting season is another bad idea. Please restore some common sense to your plan. Since enforcement of off-roading regulations is increasingly difficult, if not impossible, the expansion of off-roading to more trails and more areas is not wise. Enforcement would be easier and the damage to the forest could be minimized if off-roading were constrained to specific, non-sensitive areas.	
42	080122-22-02	Administration	Compliance		There needs to be a balance between the number of locations for OHVs and the ability to police and maintain each location.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
43	080116-14-01	Administration	Concession		With current resources, the FS cannot effectively manage widespread use as proposed. Concentrate OHV use in well-defined areas that can be enforced. Include an option to contain OHV use in 200-acre parks that can be franchised in a manner similar to ski areas.	1
44	080118-08-07	Administration	Funding	Compliance	Stanislaus Forest has a record of not having the monetary capability or incentive to enforce OHV use in already illegal environmentally impacted areas. Any California OHV Recreation Division money along with Stanislaus NF resources will not provide adequate law enforcement and maintenance for the drastically dispersed program in the Proposed Action. The FS must prove that it can enforce the chosen plan.	5
45	071206-02-02	Administration	Funding	Maintenance	If the Forest Service cannot afford to maintain a trail, don't. I will be maintained by the user, or become closed by nature.	4
46	080122-27-06	Administration	Funding	Maintenance	Provide for adequate maintenance and administration of designations based on availability of resources and funding to do so.	5
47	071221-02-02	Administration	Funding	Maintenance	Surely with the human and financial resources of the FS stretched thin and the maintenance backlog growing, a proposal to eliminate only 24 miles of the more than 2,000 miles of existing roads and trails in the forest is inadequate.	5
48	080117-10-02	Administration	Funding	Maintenance	You asked for comments to be site specific. But that is virtually impossible as the proposed map of routes is mind-boggling and far too complex to allow site specific comments. I attended the Nov.29th meeting at Sonora Oaks in Sonora and listened carefully to the various STF experts. Their attempts to explain the necessity for such enlarged access of our threatened and endangered wilderness clearly seemed an exercise in futility. Again and again the reason would finally boil down to the fact that it was federally mandated. One and another frankly admitted that they were sorely challenged to police, maintain and address various issues of concern on the existing, and as yet illegal, trail system. Furthermore, they expected this to be a continuing condition. I very much appreciated their honesty. In addition to a lack of manpower, equipment and budget, the time allotted to complete the Miwok District Plan seems totally unrealistic. This according to your own STF members present.	5
49	080122-28-06	Administration	Funding	Maintenance	Provide for adequate maintenance and administration of designations based on availability of resources and funding to do so.	
50	080111-06-02	Administration	Funding	Maintenance	I am also concerned that the FS does not have the resources necessary to maintain such an extensive OHV route program, and that the resulting over extension will result in road erosion and damage to the river canyon.	
51	080118-22-04	Administration	Funding	Maintenance	The need to adjust both the core transportation system and recreation travel network in light of funding limitations for maintenance, monitoring, and enforcement.	
52	080115-05-05	Administration	Funding		Funding can be augmented through OHV registration fees and usage fees for all users. The system must first be created, then the fees can be used for maintenance and enforcement. Depending on the government to provide proper funding for enforcement of the new regulations is a dream. User fees need to be established and earmarked for this purpose.	1
53	080122-10-04	Administration	Funding		Future budget allocations from the State of California are unlikely, given current economic circumstances in California.	1
54	080114-06-03	Administration	Funding		You folks don't have the money or resources to manage this.	5
55	080122-09-02	Administration	Funding		My second request is that you discuss cost of maintaining OHV routes and the environmental impact of erosion, siltation and loss of forest productivity due to your inability to obtain funds to do maintenance of your road inventory and of the OHV routes you are going to designate.	5
56	080122-16-01	Administration	Funding		I want to preface my comments with the undeniable fact that the Forest Service has an excessive high unfunded road maintenance backlog and many more roads than it can manage.	5
57	080122-10-02	Administration	Funding		The Stanislaus National Forest is unable to manage the existing OHV route system with existing resources. Therefore any expansion of the system is fiscally unwise.	5
58	080111-10-03	Administration	Funding		Do you have the budget and surveillance personnel to manage this route in perpetuity?	6
59	080116-12-02	Administration	Funding		Given the current economy, we question using funds for this huge undertaking.	6

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
60	080116-14-04	Administration	Funding		Incorporate trails least affected environmentally, which can be maintained by the Forest Service with its current budget. Why encourage negative behavior by legitimizing illegally created routes?	
61	080116-05-01	Administration	Funding		The resources available to the USFS to manage, maintain, and enforce legitimate OHV use are scarce. No new roads or trails should be commissioned that cannot be managed, maintained and enforced within the existing budgetary resources that the USFS has. No user created roads or trails should be legitimized since these are violations of existing USFS policy, and legitimizing them encourages continued violations.	
62	080117-02-02	Administration	Funding		There is no way that you can expect to maintain this extensive system of roads and trails with your limited budget and personnel. The only responsible course of action is to reduce the extent of off-highway vehicle roads and trails to what you can reasonably maintain in good condition and reduce use of these vehicles in our forest to what you can manage to enforce.	
63	080107-02-03	Administration	Funding		With current resources, the FS cannot effectively manage widespread OHV use as proposed. Concentrate and limit OHV use to well-defined areas that can be managed.	
64	080114-03-01	Administration	Funding		It is crucial that the Draft EIS explicitly consider the total costs of maintenance, management and enforcement to ensure that the identified environmental impacts are realistic within project funding.	
65	080118-13-02	Administration	Maintenance	Monitoring	Furthermore, it seems that the size of the proposed expansion of roads permitted to off road vehicles is very large and possibly too large to be maintained and monitored by the Forest Service, which would leave much of the potential damage caused by the increased traffic unnoticed and quickly lead to more negligence by people visiting the area.	5
66	080116-04-01	Administration	Maintenance	Watershed	I understand that, prior to the current Interface Trails Plan, OHV riders were not self-policing, unauthorized trails were created and there was rampant destruction from motorized use in sensitive areas. I also understand that it is a known fact that roads and trails that are not maintained cause erosion, damage habitat and threaten water supplies, and that the FS already struggles fiscally to maintain its existing roads.	5
67	080110-03-01	Administration	Maintenance		Boards Crossing road on 5N75 in the 1940's and 1950's was maintained by the U.S. Forest Service.	5
68	080117-07-02	Administration	Maintenance		There are over 3,400 miles of roads and trails within the Stanislaus Forest. Over the past decade or so, we have seen a steady deterioration of many roads and trails due to inadequate levels of maintenance and excessive (and often abusive) use. Roads between Sawmill Mountain and Evergreen Road north of the State Hwy 120 corridor are just one area with poorly maintained roads, and a graphic example.	5
69	071228-01-02	Administration	Maintenance		In several location around Bear Top and with under ground utility, maintenance occurs on a regular basis resulting in open ditches, trenches and spoils piles within the road system. Will the USFS create & maintain pullouts for passing, will they use signage to control speed. How much dust mitigation will they provide?"	6
70	080119-01-06	Administration	Maintenance		The mileage of routes proposed to remain open is far above the FS ability to be maintained and should be reduced considerably.	
71	080115-05-04	Administration	Private Property	Conflicts	Enforcement is the only way to make this plan work. If you don't enforce the rules, whatever they end up being, there will be no rules. If you do not have the funding mechanism in place to enforce the rules, do not make any new rules. They will be ignored. This will lead to more upset users and landowners.	5
72	080122-09-01	Administration	Safety	Speed Limits	I ask that you extensively discuss the impact of mixed use on safety of young riders. Discuss options to increase safety by discuss requiring unlicensed bike riders to pass a safety course before riding in the STF, discuss other options to improve safety training, impose speed limits on all vehicles and post danger and low speed limit signs.	5
73	080122-27-04	Administration	Safety		Provide for public safety.	5
74	080122-28-04	Administration	Safety		Provide for public safety.	5
75	080122-16-08	Administration	Signing	Seasonal Closures	Erect signs which designate road segments authorized for motorized vehicle use, by type. Any segments of roads unsigned are closed and users are subject to citation. Seasonal closure signs must indicate the purpose for such closure.	2
76	080119-01-12	Administration	Signing		Consider posting only open routes so that the temptation of destroying signs is removed; no sign for allowed type of use, then no motorized use.	2

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
77	071206-02-04	Administration	Signing		Have a sign at the entry point of the forest that states, "Use at your own risk. Any person or vehicle stuck or lost will be responsible for their own recovery charges".	5
78	080122-06-04	Administration	Signing		We highly recommend warning signs for any roads/trails which have been in use by vehicles in the past and will be denied access in the future.	5
79	080109-04-01	Administration	Signing		You need to spend more funds putting signs up on Italian Bar Road that can be clearly read by all. These vehicles are breaking the law when they drive, race and drive dangerously on our road...litter on our road.. And probably cause some damage to our dirt and gravel road. When there is a busy weekend, the visitors camp there for 2-3 nights, and I often pick up much litter. Also, when there is a big event and the road is wet from snow or rain, the pot holes are much worse.	5
80	080122-10-05	Administration	Volunteers	Maintenance	Basing future maintenance needs on promises of volunteer labor from OHV users is not sound fiscal planning.	5
81	080122-17-03	Administration	Volunteers	Maintenance	If offroaders want to continue their commendable work to restore roads and trails, they can work on the roads that are legal for them, in addition to repairing the damage their cohorts have done illegally in the past.	5
82	071126-02-03	Administration	Volunteers	Maintenance	There would be a number of local riders who would volunteer assistance in the routing and building of these trails if necessary. As we have been clearing blowdown from these trails for years, I feel certain that it would be no problem to put together a local group of volunteers to assist with trail maintenance throughout this area.	5
83	080122-06-01	Economic	Local Economy		We would request that the STF carefully consider any impacts to our tourism industry when adopting new plans or policies.	6
84	080118-17-04	NEPA	Alternatives	Cross-country Travel	We further recommend that all action alternatives in the EIS incorporate the following elements: A prohibition of cross-country motorized travel for game retrieval. However, we support the parameters for motorized access for dispersed camping provided by Forest Service regulations (up to 300' feet off of system routes), although this should not be allowed where motorized visitation is heavy enough that the potential for lasting resource impacts, including creation of non-system trails and routes, is significant. Moreover, we suggest we do not have enough information yet, in terms of analysis of potential resource impacts, to say one way or another whether the Forest's proposal to allow cross-country motorized travel for 100 ft. on each side of some 2,270 miles of road or motorized trail for access to dispersed camping, parking, woodcutting, or gathering of forest products is a good idea; there may be some routes or route segments within this mileage for which this exception is inappropriate.	
85	080122-29-26	NEPA	Alternatives	Funding	CSERC urges the Forest to include such a Resource-Emphasis alternative, in part to respond to realistic budget and personnel expectations for the near future. The Forest is not going to receive tens of millions of dollars for road maintenance in the near future. The Forest is not going to have a desired level of personnel available for enforcement. Reducing the system (both for roads and OHV routes) to a level that minimizes use to appropriate routes should also have financial benefits over the long term.	
86	080118-21-12	NEPA	Alternatives		Provide an alternative in the DEIS that removes all OHV use from the Stanislaus.	2
87	080118-22-05	NEPA	Alternatives		The NOI is silent on the issue of the baseline used to establish the "no action" alternative required by NEPA. In our view, the no action alternative should be limited to the designation of current motorized system routes that are supported by prior NEPA analyses or decision documents that justify their inclusion on maps and in spatial databases. We believe that any routes lacking documentation (including routes which were constructed or came into being before NEPA was enacted) should be analyzed as new unauthorized routes, in recognition of the fact that there is no record of administrative decision or analysis addressing the environmental impacts of motor vehicle use on these routes.	5
88	080118-22-06	NEPA	Alternatives		We request analysis of the following alternative to the proposed action: prohibit travel off designated roads, trails, and areas; adopt our system road and trail closure proposal (as outlined in Appendix A); and adopt our proposal for route additions and changes to the system in response to the Stanislaus National Forest proposed action (as outlined in Appendix B). We believe that this alternative constitutes a reasonable request considering we are recommending the closure of only 6% (205.25 miles) of systems roads and we are supporting the designation of an additional 26.03 miles of trails to the system (as outlined in Appendix C).	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
89	080122-29-21	NEPA	Alternatives		CSERC suggests the following: that the criteria that we've provided previously in these comments could provide a basis for such a "Resource-Emphasis" road system proposal -- by applying suggestions such as closing or converting to Administrative Use Only the majority of dead-end spurs that are one mile in length or less and which do not lead to a high-value destination or provide some other identified high-value benefit. Such a reduced overall road system would also be based on closure or Administrative Use Only for some roads within PACs and Winter Deer Range or furbearer territories where road density exceeds 3 mi/per sq mi of total road/routes. Significantly reducing the Forest's overall road system would provide many resource and taxpayer benefits, and would reduce law enforcement challenges over time and improve maintenance of the minimum necessary.	
90	080118-21-11	NEPA	Alternatives		Consider the option of creating OHV recreation areas of no more than 200 acres comparable to OHV parks on state or private land.	
91	080122-29-23	NEPA	Alternatives		For a Resource-Emphasis alternative, CSERC suggests that the currently unauthorized OHV routes identified in these comments as having environmental impacts be assigned to "unauthorized motorized trails not being designated as NFS motorized trails." Similarly, this Resource-Emphasis alternative would not designate for use the current unauthorized OHV routes that significantly contribute to the exceedence of road density objectives in PACs, winter deer range, and furbearer territories.	
92	080118-21-13	NEPA	Alternatives		Provide in the DEIS a range of alternatives from no OHV use in the Stanislaus to a level of use not more than that outlined in your Proposed Action.	
93	080118-08-06	NEPA	Alternatives		No unlicensed OHV use should be one of the alternatives in the EIS.	
94	080122-07-01	NEPA	Analysis	Roadless Areas	The EPA's primary focus in reviewing the DEIS will be to assess how well the proposed travel management plan: 1) Identifies and describes prevention or mitigation of adverse impacts from motorized travel to soils, watersheds, vegetation, wildlife habitat, water quality, drinking water sources, cultural resources and other assets of the Forest. 2) Addresses in sufficient detail the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the various alternatives. 3) Identifies and describes monitoring, enforcement, and future follow-up actions, such as maintenance, decommissioning, and route assessments. 4) conforms with the recently reinstated Roadless Rule which prohibits the designation of new routes for motor vehicles in roadless wilderness areas.	5
95	080122-16-06	NEPA	Analysis		To allow sufficient time to make the above analysis, modify or amend the MOI with the California Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Commission and the Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division of the California Department of Parks and Recreation and the final Travel Management Rule to allow one additional year to complete the analysis.	1
96	080122-01-05	NEPA	Analysis		I agree with the assessment performed by the Stewards of the Sequoia regarding the Stanislaus National Forest. Attached is the comment letter produced by this non-profit organization. Please consider their views as my own.	5
97	080118-22-07	NEPA	Analysis		How was Travel Analysis used to determine the cumulative impacts of motorized travel on the environment? How was it used to assess the available resources to maintain and operate the forest transportation system?	6
98	071206-01-01	NEPA	Maps	Hiking	Examining the maps showing the various road designations, I found it difficult to see the location of trails. This is a request to modify the maps so that hiking trails are clearly and easily read.	6
99	080122-26-03	Private Property	Compliance	Signing	We therefore, kindly ask you to help us by clearly establishing and marking boundaries for your lands and marking the trails which off roaders are allowed to use. We will do our part by marking our boundaries, erect fences and set gates. It would help significantly if your signage would also warn riders of penalties should they violate boundaries and/or remove or otherwise damage or destroy signs, which are also common occurrences in our area. We could then enlist law enforcement officials to help enforce off limit designations, stop existing vandalism and reduce our risk of a huge devastating fire.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
100	080117-01-01	Private Property	Conflicts	Access	As a property owner in the middle of the STF and within the area in question with the road and trail survey, I would like to strongly urge this body to prohibit any and all public use within a reasonable distance of private land and property. Especially concern of riding on 3N09 thru Hulls Meadow area are crucial to the safety and serenity of the residents there. These riders, whether they are 4X4's, ATV, Motorcycles, Cars, or Trucks find no limit to their trespassing and harassment of the area. These individuals spare no one or no property either their high speed, dust, and arrogance towards property owners and their rights.	
101	080122-18-02	Private Property	Conflicts	Camping	Sierra Pacific owns a lot of this property and has placed no trespassing and no camping signs all over this area there should be no riding also. I quit hunting this area for a while but, plan on hunting again this area in the future.	1
102	080122-26-01	Private Property	Conflicts	Close Routes	We own a 500 acre goat and cattle ranch on Schilling Road, in an area generally known as Buckhorn Flat, which comprises the slopes just below Buckhorn Peak. Our main gate is almost opposite the point where Buckhorn Fire Road intersects Schilling Road. Buckhorn fire road, from that intersection, winds East for a few miles, through private property, and terminates at the North Fork of the Merced River, which we understand is also the beginning of Stanislaus National Forest lands. This fire road has been formally abandoned by CDF and has a large sign at its intersection of Schilling Road stating it is not a public road.	1
103	080122-03-01	Private Property	Conflicts	Close Routes	I spoke with you yesterday regarding our road which is the 3N12 or Star Ridge Road. This road crosses private property before it gets to the NFS road, which you stated has always been open to all types of vehicles. We would like to request that this road be changed to "No Public Access Status". The road itself has been maintained by the land orders since the mid 80's. The private portion of the road actually goes through the middle of our property which is Jupiter Sub 2 Lot 36. Also further in you see another private property portion of 3N12 on the map. We as property owners that maintain the road cannot afford to have the road torn up by 4 wheel drive and 2 wheel drive vehicles that have no respect for the road itself or ones property.	
104	080122-28-15	Private Property	Conflicts	Close Routes	The area bordered on the east by the Calaveras Big Trees State Park, on the south by the north fork of the Stanislaus river, on the west by State Highway 4 and on the north by Love Creek Road should be designated a non-motorized buffer zone to protect property and minimize conflict between motorized vehicle riders and hikers, horseback riders, mountain bike riders and homeowners.	
105	080122-27-05	Private Property	Conflicts	Fire	This area is too small for a destination OHV use. This is the Urban Wildland Interface area that is not compatible with OHV use as motorized vehicles start fires and will endanger the community of Love Creek.	
106	080122-28-05	Private Property	Conflicts	Fire	This area is too small for a destination OHV use. This is the Urban Wildland Interface area that is not compatible with OHV use as motorized vehicles start fires and will endanger the community of Love Creek.	
107	080122-27-14	Private Property	Conflicts	Noise	This ridge lies squarely in the wildland urban interface abutting the community of Love Creek. The area is a bowl that drives sound directly into the canyon. When one vehicle travels across the ridge the sound carries for miles. When a loop is established and Off-Road Vehicles are directed to this new area, the impact on homeowners and other recreationists will be profound. This is the wrong place to put an off road vehicle trail network.	5
108	080122-28-14	Private Property	Conflicts	Noise	This ridge lies squarely in the wildland urban interface abutting the community of Love Creek. The area is a bowl that drives sound directly into the canyon. When one vehicle travels across the ridge the sound carries for miles. When a loop is established and Off-Road Vehicles are directed to this new area, the impact on homeowners and other recreationists will be profound. This is the wrong place to put an off road vehicle trail network.	5
109	080117-11-04	Private Property	Conflicts	Right of Way	Remove the proposed contingent access to roads 4N80Y and 4N73Y. As part owner of one of these roads, I will not grant any easements on the road that would include OHV access. In addition, OHV use of this road will create unacceptable levels of dust and noise for the property owners along the road and in Canyon View subdivision. Even with OHVs officially prohibited from 4N80Y I have had illegal trespass on my property by OHVs. They created runs by cutting down young trees and created ruts and erosion problems.	
110	080110-04-04	Private Property	Conflicts	Safety	4N809Y and 4N73Y are too close to family homes where OHVs would endanger children and encourage trespassing.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
111	080122-26-02	Private Property	Conflicts	Safety	Nevertheless, almost every weekend, bike and ATV riders from the Date Flat area follow the Ponderosa Way Trail and the Tin Fuel Break trail to the point where the latter intersects the beginning of Buckhorn fire Road on the North Fork of the Merced River. The riders then follow this road through private properties down to Schilling Road where they spin donuts on our graveled driveway and damage mail boxes and fences and gates, not to mention the havoc they cause on our Pyrenees guard dogs. A solid steel gate, which was erected at the beginning of The Buckhorn fire road at Schilling Road, has been ripped out and dragged away on numerous occasions. An adjacent gate with posts set in a considerable amount of concrete, which accesses private property, and is a few hundred feet North of the Buckhorn Fire Road gate also gets ripped out repeatedly so that riders can give themselves a second exciting choice over the raw countryside (private property) to and from the North Fork of the Merced River.	
112	080122-28-02	Private Property	Conflicts	User Conflicts	The EPRTA was involved in the community compromise that helped to resolve the Interface trails conflict north of Arnold. During that process, participants from both the motorized and non-motorized groups developed a shared vision that the impact from motorized use should not simply be shifted from one community to another, but that trails should be designed to succeed by siting them away from areas of conflict such as near existing homes. The current plan places new trails adjacent to homes and in an area that will lead to increased conflict between motorized recreationists, homeowners and other non-motorized recreation interests.	
113	080116-14-06	Private Property	Conflicts	Wild and Scenic River	Candy Rock Rd, 4N80Y and its spur, 4N73Y. The Forest Service is proposing that unlicensed OHVs be allowed on these roads for the first time. Although in the past the district ranger said OHVs on Candy Rock would not happen. It is now listed as "contingent motorized access". If the Stanislaus USFS adopts the plan with this road included there are a number of homes that would be negatively impacted by the noise and dust created by OHVs. Specifically those on 4N80Y and those in Canyon View subdivision above the canyon where I live. Allowing OHV use so close to residential properties, & crossing private land, encourages trespass and conflict between homeowners, riders & the USFS. In addition, it can result in lowered property values. 4N80Y ends up at the North Fork of the Stanislaus River which has been designated as a potential wild and scenic river by the Forest Service. The river and the river canyon are supposed to be managed in a way to protect these special qualities. Allowing OHV use in the canyon will not protect these values. Please understand this is a serious issue.	
114	080116-14-05	Private Property	Conflicts	Wilderness	To avoid trespass and conflict, keep OHV use away from wilderness access, environmentally sensitive areas, and residential properties. Eliminate the "contingent" access to Candy Rock Road in Hathaway Pines to protect the Stanislaus River Canyon & private property, and eliminate other roads and trails with similar circumstances.	
115	080107-02-04	Private Property	Conflicts	Wilderness	To avoid trespass and conflict, keep OHV used away from wilderness, sensitive areas, residential and other private properties, particularly along the Stanislaus River Canyon, San Antonio Ck., Beaver Ck., Summit Level Road and the various communities on the Hwy 4 corridor.	
116	080118-15-02	Private Property	Conflicts	Wildlife	If OHV travel is permitted along any portion of this road, there will certainly be OHVs traveling on residential private property. Based on the historical traits of some OHV users, I believe that there would be travel on private property, off of the designated road, and onto sensitive habitat.	
117	080118-15-03	Private Property	Conflicts		Please consider my families need for a safe place to recreate and exercise within walking distance of our home a sensitive use.	1
118	080117-11-06	Private Property	Conflicts		Road 4N73Y leads to a user created "shooting range" at the top of the old quarry and its popularity is increasing. Many vehicles my road on the way to this shooting range every day. I have bullet holes in my truck. My neighbor has had windows in his cabin shot out. Trees on private property adjacent to the "shooting range" are full of lead. The noise is a nuisance to those of us on 4N80Y and in the Canyon View subdivision. Large caliber weapons whose bullets can travel great distances are regularly fired there. At least the part of 4N73Y leading to this "shooting range" should be closed and another area away from homes should be designated as an area to shoot.	1

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
119	080118-07-01	Private Property	Conflicts		As private timberland owners and managers, we are subject to regulatory oversight by several state agencies. This regulatory authority can include the mandating of costly corrective actions, if agency personnel deem there has been road damage or proper maintenance has been compromised. The source or cause of the problem matters not in the least- as the timberland and road owner we are still the liable party. Most of the road damage we incur comes from public access, particularly during the late fall, winter, or early spring periods.	5
120	080114-06-02	Private Property	Conflicts		Candy rock, 4N80Y and 4N73 are much too close to residential areas.	5
121	080122-27-01	Private Property	Conflicts		Four generations of our family have lived and worked on our historic ranch in the Love Creek area of Avery. We are currently in negotiations with a land-trust to preserve this land as part of a larger "working landscape" project to protect this valley. The proposed plan threatens this effort by locating off-road vehicle trails in close proximity to our land.	5
122	080111-10-02	Private Property	Conflicts		Further, have you considered what this does to the human inhabitants on the route, whose homes will be disturbed and/or perhaps vandalized.	5
123	080117-06-02	Private Property	Conflicts		Having a separate area away from residences set aside for OHVs, like White Pines, has been a win-win situation. Besides creating a more pleasant environment for the residences, hikers, snowshoers and skiers, the motorized vehicle riders benefit from not having to dodge hikers. They can enjoy their sport without greatly impacting others.	5
124	080118-15-01	Private Property	Conflicts		I am concerned that the proposed OHV use on Candy Rock Road, 4N80Y and 4N73Y will create conflicts between residential uses and the proposed use. Already, there are residents unhappy with the shooting noise that happens at the quarry.	5
125	080116-04-02	Private Property	Conflicts		I believe that keeping OHV routes separate from non-motorized recreation and away from private property and sensitive areas reduces conflicts and trespass, and that concentrating OHV use in defined areas enables much more effective enforcement.	5
126	080111-02-01	Private Property	Conflicts		I believe that OHV travel is the greatest threat to wildness on our National Forest lands, and I have been an OHV users. I came to this conclusion during the 35 years my wife and I owned a cabin bordering STF in Peter Pam Subdivision. During this time motorized recreation often interrupted our tranquility, damage roads and trails, disturbed and frightened wildlife, and were a general nuisance.	5
127	080119-02-01	Private Property	Conflicts		In my opinion Forest Service roads 4N80Y and 4N37Y shouldn't be opened to any recreational internal combustion vehicles. Just as assuredly as you don't want me spinning my quad on your front lawn..the residents of these areas are entitled to the peaceful residence they bought into. If this isn't enough, "think of the animals!" or something.	5
128	080116-04-04	Private Property	Conflicts		It makes sense that, to avoid trespass and conflict, the Forest Service should keep OHV use away from wilderness, sensitive areas, and residential properties.	5
129	080104-01-04	Private Property	Conflicts		Our home is located near 4N02, and we have observed countless violations, such as driving around gates, pulling gates out of the ground, driving on closed areas, littering, cutting down trees, starting illegal fires, etc.	5
130	080118-14-01	Private Property	Conflicts		I am commenting on the Designated Route Plan for OHVs on Candy Rock Rd, or more precisely Forest Service road 4N80Y and the spur road off of it, 4N73Y. I am strongly opposed to this possibility, as it will directly affect our quality of life, we who live in the Canyon View subdivision. I live on Utica Drive, and have heard the incredibly loud buzz of OHVs more than a few times racing up and down the canyon across from me. As the location you are considering is in a very steep canyon, the noise is directly intrusive to the homes on our side of canyon cut by Mill Creek. I would hope you could find an area in our vast forest that would not have this specific trait of sound carrying and excessive noise pollution.	
131	080122-04-01	Private Property	Conflicts		It is imperative to both my business and private residence, and my enjoyment of organized areas of recreational types that the trails east of Bear Valley that you are currently considering as possibly motorized: the mountain will lose, the homeowners will lose, and I and my customers will lose if these trails get designated motorized. With the private property they cross and the locked gates they have to go around, I'm frankly surprised they even got on the map in the first place.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
132	080122-27-13	Private Property	Conflicts		Assure compatibility of wheeled motor vehicle use with existing conditions in populated areas, taking into account sound, emissions, etc.	
133	080122-28-13	Private Property	Conflicts		Assure compatibility of wheeled motor vehicle use with existing conditions in populated areas, taking into account sound, emissions, etc.	
134	080117-07-06	Private Property	Conflicts		For neighbors to, in-holders, and leases of public lands, intrusions into our private space by noise, dust, and travel is a real concern. Please establish use rules, enforce them and limit travel that prevents and eliminates such intrusions – as noted below.	
135	080130-01-01	Private Property	Conflicts		I am writing with particular concern regarding forest roads 4N35, 5N57, and 4N04, bordered on the east by the Calaveras Big Trees State Park, on the south by the Stanislaus river, on the west by St. Hwy 4, and on the north by Love Creek Road. Our family intends to preserve our land from development to retain its character, which still resembles the early homestead and includes the original barns and outbuildings constructed 125 yrs ago. Our property was used for countless years by Native Americans and contains an ancient grinding rock area that was still in use in my lifetime. An off-road trail would be completely inappropriate to our ranch and would threatened the historic character of the area.	
136	080115-01-05	Private Property	Conflicts		Please place use away from homes and businesses to avoid trespass and the disruption of noise and dust.	
137	080118-08-02	Private Property	Conflicts		Poor decisions, lack of consideration for nearby land owners, continued law enforcement problems, and ignoring the public input by FS management in the PA is demonstrated by locating fragmented routes for unlicensed OHV use in the Cedar Ridge Area. Long established daily trespass to get to public land occurs across private land in this area.	
138	080104-04-02	Private Property	Conflicts		SPI does not support the proposal for a Trail Development Analysis in proximity to Blue Mountain. Any formal recreational site at this location would mean traversing miles of dirt road to access the site, possible spill-over of OHV traffic onto adjacent SPI lands, and complaints from other neighbors in the area from the noise, dust, mud, and other side-effects arising from such use.	
139	080117-01-02	Private Property	Conflicts		The main route of 3N09 goes through private property. This area was once entirely private with no access to the public. Excessive speed by non-homeowners, dust, trespass and vandalism, and always fire.	
140	080122-27-02	Private Property	Conflicts		The proposed plan will exacerbate trespassing and vandalism that already occur by off-road vehicle users who access our land from adjacent forest lands. Noise and dust from this activity already causes daily disruptions to the enjoyment of our property- creating a designated trail system on the ridge above us will further degrade our quality of life and will lead to intense conflicts between local property owners and motorized recreationists.	
141	080100-04-02	Private Property	Conflicts		These roads are too close to residences to be used as an OHV route. These residences would be negatively impacted via the noise and dust.	
142	080122-14-06	Private Property	Fire		I could go on about the potential for erosion and fire danger, but I know that the Forest Service takes this into consideration when a proposal like this is made. The potential for both these problems exists anywhere, but due to the proximity of this park to existing residences these problems and particularly the fire danger, are a more serious threat, not leaving any kind of buffer between this proposed park and full time residents, increasing the danger even beyond that which already exists when living in a wildland urban interface.	4
143	080117-12-04	Private Property	Noise	Conflicts	The roads surrounding the Bear Valley village have been designated as OHV trails in this proposal? Why? This is an area that is currently heavily-used by bikers, hikers, OHV users as well as street-legal vehicles. Additionally, noise created on these roads impact the residents in the village. Why is the recreational activity that has the most impact on other users and the nearby residents given preference? Given the high level of use by other recreational activities, shouldn't some roads be designated for their use as well? A more balanced approach would be to designate a road or two nearer the village as hiking/horseback/bicycle use only since these uses are usually incompatible with heavy off-road vehicle use. Are there any trails designated for non-motorized use only within walking distance of the village?	6
144	080122-22-03	Private Property	Noise	Conflicts	Right in Greeley Hill at the corner of Ponderosa and Dexter, a local outfitter had set up a course on private property without permission. Noise and dust from vehicles is an issue near homes.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
145	080116-12-01	Private Property	Noise	Conflicts	We are against this for several reasons but primarily because it would be too close to homes on 4N80Y and 4N73Y. Those homes were purchased for the peace and tranquility the area provides. It is imperative we keep these areas pristine for this generation and all generations to follow.	
146	080122-25-01	Private Property	Noise	Safety	My experience has not been favorable with motor bikes and trucks on the trails. I have a forest road approx. 100 yards behind my cabin. It has led to trespassing, a major break-in, with about a 10,000 dollar loss, and vandalism to the property. This is due to the fact that people can access the property from the rear undetected. Please consider the location of the road and how close to homes they are. Noise is also a consideration.	
147	080113-02-02	Private Property	Noise		There are a number of homes in the area which would suffer from the presence of the vehicles.	5
148	080118-10-01	Private Property	Noise		I have property that backs up to the forest in Arnold, and we have been repeatedly disturbed by the sound of motorized traffic that goes on in those woods close to our cabin.	
149	080117-07-01	Private Property	Resources		We suggest the following guidelines be added to your analysis: 1. An outdoor ethics code is adopted: similar to the Leave No Trace code adopted by various agencies for river corridors. 2. A "Good Neighbor Policy" be adopted that: a. Sets a minimum distance standard between any such use and private land where the private land owner/leasee is assured that there shall be no abusive intrusion of light, noise, or particulate matter from such use. We recommend a minimum distance of one thousand (1,000) feet from such boundaries. b. Travel on roads or trails leading to or through private lands are off limits to recreational vehicle travel unless the NFS constructs a suitable barrier (fence and gate) stopping access to the private land. c. Travel through drainages that may affect the quality of water flowing through or onto private lands or leases be restricted unless appropriate water quality mitigations are in place, functional and maintained. d. All trash, human waste and debris from such vehicle use be policed and removed to be out of sight from view from said private land or lease, and with private party's cooperation picked up and removed from private land or lease. 3. Mixed-use	5
150	071127-01-07	Private Property	Right of Way	Events	17EV224 - (section 26): MDR would like the FS to work with SPI to grant access on this route. While general public access is desired, event only access could be the fall back position.	1
151	071210-01-01	Private Property	Right of Way		OHV access thru my property on Mt. Elizabeth Drive: Proposed map shows licensed vehicle access although this road is on private property and is not part of the county road system. Does the Forest Service have right of way (none shown on my title search in 1998). I have plans to gate this at the fork in the road where Mt. Eliz Dr. begins. (this road leads thru an open 120 acres of FS land and goes to Cedar Ridge).	
152	080104-04-01	Private Property	Seasonal Closures	Soils	Roads east of Hermit Springs: public use is permitted, but with a seasonal closure of November 30 to May. Some of these roads are located partially or entirely on SPI lands. We have some concerns with this. We observed many of our forest roads damaged by irresponsible public use, and this damage can easily occur prior to November 30. Seasonal closures need to be based on weather and ground conditions, not simply a pre-determined date. The roads crossing SPI lands need to be evaluated on a road by road basis to determine potential for road damage and water quality degradation	
153	080108-04-01	Private Property	Seasonal Closures		We propose a gate to be installed at Moore Ck. Campground so people cannot drive up the hill in winter to become trapped inside SPI's locked winter gates and tear up roads and access our private property.	
154	080102-07-01	Private Property	Signing	Conflicts	Regarding the Boundary Sign (on Township Line near Greeley Hill, Co Rd J132), it is not on the boundary of the Forest. It's not on the road right of way. It is on private property It needs to be removed. It misleads the public into believing they are within the SF and causes confrontations with private property owners	1
155	080116-08-01	Private Property	Signing		Rd. 2S42 off Greeley Rd to Argo Mine be posted "Private Use Only."	1
156	080102-06-03	Private Property	Conflicts	Wilderness	Please do not allow off-road use that invites trespass on private land or into wilderness areas.	
157	080110-07-02	Private Property	Conflicts		As a homeowner I am very concerned about increased traffic through the subdivision. I do not see any reason for the proposed changes in and around Bear Valley as we have, what I believe, a good setup for both the motorized and non-motorized areas at this time.	5
158	080111-05-01	Private Property	Noise	Soils	I want to let you know that roads called 4N80Y and 4N73Y are too close to my home to allow OHV use. I'm worried about noise and erosion in this canyon area.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
159	080119-01-04	Recreation	Camping		Approved established campsites of further distance can be posted for use	5
160	071206-02-03	Recreation	Camping		Allow reasonable, low impact travel to existing primitive camp spots & fishing access. Allow reasonable, low impact travel to remove downed wood for camp fires and prevent fire hazards.	
161	080116-11-01	Recreation	Noise	User Conflicts	When figuring out where motorized routes of travel should be the Forest Service should keep in mind the needs of the MANY, many visitors to the Forest (indeed, the majority of visitors!) who do NOT come for motorized-vehicle recreation. They shouldn't discriminate against people who wish to hike or families who want to go for a walk from a campground without being disturbed by noise, dust, or pollution of off-road vehicles. (Two wilderness areas on the Stanislaus Forest, that I am acquainted with, the Carson-Iceberg and the Emigrant, while valuable and important for remote dispersed recreation and for wildlife, don't accommodate all the visitors, often families, who just wish for some short and quiet walking places that can be reached from roadside campgrounds, without the challenge of accessing wilderness.)	5
162	080130-01-03	Recreation	Noise	User Conflicts	I am very concerned that the existing problems of noise, trespassing and vandalism by off-road vehicles will increase. Even the most law abiding and respectful riders already create a huge blight of noise and dust, and fear of more forest fires.	
163	080118-13-01	Recreation	Noise	User Conflicts	I have been lucky enough to visit the area around roads 4N80Y and 4N73Y on the North Fork canyon of the Stanislaus River. The beauty of the area and it's attraction to those who live there are the natural peace and quiet, the remoteness from highways and traffic, and the serenity of wilderness and natural forest. If off road vehicles were allowed to this area, it would cause not only a great amount of noise pollution, but also greatly increase the human damage to the natural environment such as air and water pollution, erosion, destruction of habitat and possible conflict with the people who make peaceful homes along those roads.	
164	080113-01-02	Recreation	Noise	User Conflicts	OHV users speak of the "family experience" of their sport. It also spoils the family experience for those who engage in walking, skiing and snowshoeing. The very nature of the OHV, besides, the noise and pollution, is that it encourages users to test its capabilities--jumps, donating, wheelies, speed--all of which will damage our forest and are dangerous for inexperienced riders. I would strongly endorse expansion of the Stanislaus model throughout the State, and wish to express my opposition to any designation of expanded roads for OHV use which will only dilute present regulation of these vehicles, and further damage natural resources, despite the best efforts of responsible riders.	
165	080111-06-01	Recreation	Noise	Wild and Scenic River	I write to express my concern about the possibility of OHV use on 4N80Y and the spur road off of it, 4N73Y. Opening these roads of OHV use would disrupt the wildness of the place every day with noise and dust; OHV access would also drive away wildlife and damage the "wild and scenic" qualities of the NF Stanislaus river.	
166	071219-03-01	Recreation	Noise	Wilderness	As a hiker, backpacker, and x country skier, nothing ruins an outing like being passed by a string of motorcycles, snowmobiles, etc. The sad thing is that one of them can ruin the wilderness experience for us over several square miles. Please do not add yet more motor trails and roads- you can't police or maintain the ones you have.	
167	080116-05-02	Recreation	Noise		OHV use is incompatible with quiet recreation. It is destructive to the environment. It creates pollution, erosion, dust, noise, and disturbance to watersheds and wildlife. It should not be allowed near private residences, in wilderness areas, in environmentally sensitive areas, or in areas that potentially could be designated as "wilderness" or as "wild and scenic."	
168	080117-07-07	Recreation	Non-motorized	User Conflicts	Compatibility with non-motorized travel use, such as hiking and equestrian, do not appear to be adequately addressed. Please consider specific and limited areas for incompatible uses, or time-of-year limitations on type of use. Horsepower and speed characteristic of motorized vehicles (including OHVs) far out weight and overwhelms hikers and horseback riders, and the ability of normal environmental forces to recover from damaging or dangerous encounters. Therefore, the preferred usage is to restrict use to limited areas that can be maintained to healthy forest standards and eliminates or minimizes hiker and horseback rider contact.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
169	080122-21-04	Recreation	Non-motorized	User Conflicts	My hiking friends and I enjoy the Stanislaus National Forest and other public lands with little or no impact. We leave a few footprints, take a few photos, appreciate the forest and do virtually nothing to disrupt other people in their enjoyment of the forest. Off-roaders with their dust, noise, erosion and exhaust obviously make much bigger impacts. They are highly disruptive to ecosystems and other people. Please come up with a plan that provides long-term protection for the forest. The STF should not become an amusement park for people who love internal combustion engines at the expense of everyone else.	
170	080122-17-02	Recreation	Non-motorized		I didn't attend the Modesto meeting which apparently was packed with off-roaders, but be assured there are many hikers, backpackers and riders who support more effective control of off-roaders. These self professed environmentalists may not realize how their recreation adversely affects those who would like to experience nature's sounds and quiet, in addition to the wildlife that is impacted.	5
171	080122-04-02	Recreation	Non-motorized		It is my opinion that we as a board should support the mountain (Bear Valley) request to leave the trails that up and over the ski area (18EV287, 18EV288 & 288A, 18EV286, 17EV280 & 17EV279 as non-motorized in the summer. We have a great OHV trail system to the west of town and that has always been the designated area for this activity. The ski area plans operate a lift with hiking and mt. biking utilizing these exit trails (currently designated and approved as mt biking trails and designated as motorized) in a couple of years and it would be a shame to designate these routes as motorized then have to remove them as the conflicts grow.	
172	080107-01-02	Recreation	User Conflicts	Private Property	OHV routes should be separate from non-motorized trails and away from private properties.	5
173	080122-02-01	Recreation	User Conflicts	Safety	I have encountered motorized vehicles in the forest, and many of the operators seem friendly, respectful and travel at a manageable speed that allows them to slow down in time for us to move out of the way. The rest of the encounters, however, have been frightening because the vehicle operators were traveling in large groups at unmanageable speeds without any regard for living creatures that might be in their path. In my opinion, the biggest concern in our region of the forest right now is to control the high speed traffic and its impact on the environment and public safety.	
174	080115-05-01	Recreation	User Conflicts	Shared Use	The fact is, motorized vehicles bother and harass horses, hikers, and bicyclists; horses, hikers and bicyclists don't bother and harass motorized vehicles.	5
175	071213-05-02	Recreation	User Conflicts	Shared Use	We wish to avoid trail use conflicts that would happen if the trails are opened for sharing with foot, bicycling, and equestrian traffic.	5
176	080117-12-01	Recreation	User Conflicts		Balanced Approach: This EIS should be considering and evaluating other closely-related recreational uses simultaneously with motorized use. Clearly hiking, biking and horseback riders, as well as other recreational users, use the same road and trail network, yet this proposal only considers motorized use.	1
177	071123-01-01	Recreation	User Conflicts		OHVs are generally very obnoxious to most forest visitors be it hikers, campers, horsemen, or virtually anyone else other than OHV users. This contributes to a form of environmental "road rage" -- not a healthy thing under any circumstances.	5
178	080111-08-01	Recreation	User Conflicts		I believe that off road vehicles should not be allowed on 4N80Y and 4N73Y. I've enjoyed the untouched beauty and tranquility of the NF Stanislaus River canyon and I think that it would be permanently marred by OHV traffic and noise.	5
179	080122-24-02	Recreation	User Conflicts		It seems to me that we already have sufficient areas open to all types of machines, all year. For many of us, an outdoor experience is enhanced by the natural sounds (!) Not those of machines we can hear all day.	5
180	080122-28-11	Recreation	User Conflicts		Minimize conflicts between wheeled motor vehicles and existing or proposed recreational uses of NFS lands.	5
181	080122-27-11	Recreation	User Conflicts		Minimize conflicts between wheeled motor vehicles and existing or proposed recreational uses of NFS lands.	5
182	080122-10-07	Recreation	User Conflicts		OHV use is a small percentage of recreation in our National Forests, but its impact is great. It is damaging to the environment including wildlife and watersheds. It is incompatible with other forms of recreation.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
183	080118-12-05	Recreation	User Conflicts		The Forest Service should provide information and educational opportunities for their users so that expectations and understanding of an area's uses are clear. If there is an obvious opportunity to re-direct a hiking or equestrian trail where it may coincide with an established motorized route then I believe there could be an opportunity to enhance the experience for all parties concerned. Creating areas that are available for only one or two types of users is absurd and I am opposed to it.	5
184	080118-22-05	Recreation	User Conflicts		The need to address public safety concerns, user conflicts, private property rights, lost non-motorized recreational opportunities, and impact to natural soundscapes and air quality that have arisen or might be expected to arise given recent trends in motorized use.	5
185	080115-05-03	Recreation	User Conflicts		Create separate trail heads and trails for OHV, horses, hikers, and bicycles. This can be done through a system of color-coded trail markings. Do not mix motorized and non-motorized trails together. They must be kept separate or problems will occur.	
186	080116-03-01	Recreation	User Conflicts		I hike often in the forest, sometimes on the roads, and it is incredibly disturbing when a roaring quad or a bunch of dirt bikes come racing down the road or sometimes just racing through the forest. OHVs only degrade the forest, they provide nothing positive. They make noise, disturb wildlife, damage soils, and degrade water quality.	
187	080122-27	Recreation	User Conflicts		The segment in question involves forest roads 4N35, 5N5Y, and 4N04 bordered on the east by the Calaveras Big Trees State Park, on the south by the north fork of the Stanislaus River, on the west by State Highway 4 and on the north by Love Creek Road should be managed as a non-motorized area to protect property and minimize conflict between motorized vehicle riders and hikers, horseback riders, mountain bike riders and homeowners.	
188	080122-12-01	Recreation	User Conflicts		I am disappointed at the way our hiking trails are being damaged by the motorcycles and 4-wheel cycles here in Cedar Ridge subdivision. My husband and I enjoy daily hikes by the water tower at the end of East Brookside, but the trail is being ruined by these cycles. I realize these cycles have a place in the outdoors, but they need to stay on those trails designated for them.	
189	080122-23-01	Recreation	User Conflicts		I urge you to consider those of us who enjoy nature for her own wonders, not just as a place where there is room for some to go fast and stir up dust, scare wildlife, expose tree roots, etc. Opening up more areas for their "play" would be a slap in the face to the rest of us, like we don't count!	
190	080122-18-01	Recreation	User Conflicts		While hunting the Summit Ridge road area out of Arnold, CA. (White Pines) with my brother in-law who has been hunting this area for over 50 years while we were both hunting together the last week of D-5 in 2005 we both had a surprise dirt bikes and quads were all over this area making all kinds of noise and these riders did not care we were there hunting. These idiots had no respect for hunters. There should be a time for these riders to ride but, not during hunting season.	
191	080122-29-03	Resources	Conflicts	Minimum System	This would do almost nothing to move toward the minimum necessary road system, to reduce watershed impacts, to reduce wildlife impacts, or to reduce the great range of conflicts with non-motorized recreational users of the Forest.	5
192	080113-01-01	Resources	Enforcement		Expanding motorized travel in the national forests and legitimizing unauthorized trails is a step backward. Limited law enforcement resources will be further diffused, and additional National Forest lands will be subjected to damage and erosion, with noise and air pollution covering a larger area.	5
193	071126-03-01	Resources	Fire	Global Warming	I feel that the biggest threat to a forest by man is fire, which creates so much damage with the release of pollutant and co2 emissions, while contributing to global warming too.	3
194	080130-01-02	Resources	Fire		An off-road trail would also exacerbate the danger of forest fires from human activity and negligence.	4
195	080107-02-06	Resources	Fire		Increased danger of catastrophic wild-fire caused by OHV use must also be considered.	5
196	080116-11-10	Resources	Fire		Motorized travel may increase the risk of wildfire—whether by sparks or carburetors from vehicles or by inadequate dousing of campfires or cigarettes at motorized access points. Each alternative should examine increased fire risk due to motorized access.	
197	080122-27-03	Resources	Heritage Resources		The current plan fails to meet the purpose and need stated in the scoping letter on a number of items. These are listed below in regards to the aforementioned area: Avoid impacts to cultural resources - this area has significant archeological resources and rare native plants that native people still use.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
198	080122-28-03	Resources	Heritage Resources		The current plan fails to meet the purpose and need stated in the scoping letter on a number of items. These are listed below in regards to the aforementioned area: Avoid impacts to cultural resources - this area has significant archeological resources and rare native plants that native people still use.	
199	080125-02-01	Resources	Invasive Species	Private Property	I am extremely concerned about the dissemination of invasive weeds throughout the Stanislaus NF, and not only in Mariposa County, as areas are opened up to motorized vehicles. Not only are these invasive species adjacent to private property on which the property owners are actively engaged in weed control, but they are also present in staging areas for OHV use. Increased OHV use will lead to increased soil disturbance and distribution of noxious weed seeds, not only along the right-of-ways, but also into other areas of the forest as well as being transported out on the area on vehicles parked in the yellow starthistle infested staging areas. Currently Mariposa County is using County, State, and Federal (including USFS grants) funds to combat invasive weeds species. It seems extremely counterproductive to turn around and provide a source through increased OHV use to disseminate weed seeds. Invasive species such as yellow starthistle are notorious hitch-hikers and OHVs would seem to be ideal candidates to provide the "ride".	
200	080109-07-02	Resources	Invasive Species		The OHVs transport invasive species into areas that would not have been previously accessible.	5
201	080116-11-08	Resources	Invasive Species		Undesirable plants, in particular noxious (invasive weeds are, along with OHVs, among the "four threats" to National Forest. How will each alternative affect the spread of noxious weeds.	6
202	071123-01-02	Resources	Noise	Air Quality	The worst offenders are those OHVs with 2-cycle engines. They pollute the environment with extreme noise and extreme hydrocarbon emissions as well.	5
203	080114-06-01	Resources	Noise	Global Warming	Historically, they, (OHVs) have rarely been able to discipline their ranks and continue to degrade the environment, contribute to global warming with their fossil fueled vehicles, created noise pollution and frighten wildlife as well.	5
204	080111-10-01	Resources	Noise	Soils	Regarding proposal to allow OHVs on roads 4N80Y and 4N73Y in the NF Stanislaus river canyon: Once this traffic is allowed, there will be no end of noise and disturbance in the area, which leads directly to an area designated valuable for wildlife habitat and scenic beauty.	5
205	080122-01-03	Resources	Seasonal Closures	Soils	The proposed action #9 is excessive. The prevention of resource damage is addressed as "Restricted Motor Vehicle Use (10G-2) in the 2005 Land Management Direction, page 23. If seasonal closure are pursued in the EIS, I feel that it would better serve the users of the STF by narrowing the range of closure dates to a minimum and providing the FS discretion in closing these areas earlier or opening them later as weather conditions warrant. The current proposal of seasonal closures of up to seven months is too restrictive.	5
206	080108-03-01	Resources	Seasonal Closures		I propose you find an alternative to ditching the old road leaving Hunter Flat going parallel to Winton to Folsom Lookout to keep people out seasonally.	1
207	071221-03-02	Resources	Sensitive Plants	Wildlife	I have a concern that sensitive plant species are being left out in the consideration of routes. I have a concern that sensitive animal species, while intensively studied may not receive consideration in route planning.	
208	080118-08-05	Resources	Sensitive Plants		On maps at the public hearings, citizens expressed their concern for impacts to the Deer Creek fawn lily and two other sensitive plants located in the Deer Creek area. I have personally seen indiscriminate OHV tracks over fawn lilies in this area.	
209	071206-04-01	Resources	Soils	Global Warming	Please do not allow 4-wheelers in the STF. They are loud, create large ruts and erosion by irresponsible riders and add to global warming.	5
210	080118-07-02	Resources	Soils	Seasonal Closures	In as much as the onset and cessation of the wet period varies from year to year we believe a closure reflecting the actual moisture conditions of that specific year to be preferable to the arbitrary closure of December through April.	5
211	080122-06-03	Resources	Soils	Seasonal Closures	Our group is in agreement regarding "seasonal closure" and would encourage these measures only when "appropriate". We strongly suggest any closures be based on weather and safety conditions and not on a "set date" each year.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
212	080118-22-08	Resources	Soils	Seasonal Closures	The Forest should implement seasonal wet weather closures of native surface roads and motorized trails to reduce erosion and sedimentation, to lower maintenance costs, and to reduce harassment and poaching of wildlife during times when they are most vulnerable. While we would agree to a seasonal closure triggered by precipitation or conditions on the ground, once closed these routes should remain closed until the end of the rainy season in the spring. A route system where multiple closures and openings are triggered by individual storm events throughout the season is too unstable and unreliable to be effectively implemented.	5
213	080118-03-02	Resources	Soils	Seasonal Closures	The proposed action #9 is excessive. The prevention of resource damage is addressed as "Restricted Motor Vehicle Use (10G-2) in the 2005 Land Management Direction, page 23. If seasonal closure are pursued in the EIS, I feel that it would better serve the users of STF by narrowing the range of closure dates to a minimum and providing the Forest Service discretion in closing these areas earlier or opening them later as weather conditions warrant. The current proposal of seasonal closures of up to seven months is too restrictive.	5
214	071128-01-01	Resources	Soils	Seasonal Closures	Route 2N02 access not on F.S... land but roads are being used and no proposed action is being put forth. Soil erosion during the wet season tears up road. Suggest seasonal closure on NFS lands.	
215	080122-27-08	Resources	Soils	Vegetation	Minimize damage to soil, vegetation and other forest resources.	5
216	080122-28-08	Resources	Soils	Vegetation	Minimize damage to soil, vegetation and other forest resources.	5
217	080116-11-09	Resources	Soils	Watershed	Roads and trails can cause soil erosion and sedimentation and thus impair water quality. Watershed issues are extremely important in Sierra Nevada national forests and effects of various alternatives should be studied. How does each alternative address sediment levels at stream crossings, trails and roads near riparian areas? Is there a threshold for route density to protect water quality?	6
218	071123-01-03	Resources	Soils	Watershed	When operating in their designed off-road capacity they cause soil erosion, which pollutes streams, degrades fisheries, and ultimately contributes to silting of reservoirs that are critical to the welfare of all citizens.	
219	080111-07-02	Resources	Soils	Wildlife	Unmanaged OHV use has resulted in unauthorized roads and trails, increased soil compaction and erosion, increased sedimentation, water quality degradation, the spread of noxious weeds, increased fire risk, damage to cultural resources, habitat destruction and fragmentation, increased disturbance to sensitive wildlife, and conflict among users.	4
220	080110-04-02	Resources	Soils		The abusive nature of off-road vehicle traffic will rapidly erode the steep canyons bordering the roads.	4
221	080122-22-01	Resources	Soils		There is cause and effect, if there is no consequence to irresponsible behavior, it is HUMAN NATURE to continue and/or worsen i.e. If the vehicles cause erosion, they should pay for it.	5
222	080118-17-01	Resources	User Conflicts		Executive Orders issued in 1972 and 1977[1], from which authority for managing OHV use on National Forest lands derive, provide that OHV use will be managed so as to protect resources and minimize conflicts among user groups. Specifically, these orders require that designated motorized areas and trails shall be located: to minimized damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, or other resources on public lands; to minimize harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats; to minimize conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreational uses-taking into account noise and other factors.	5
223	071123-01-05	Resources	Visual Resource		OHV use contributes to spreading garbage well beyond the normal clutter of roadsides.	5
224	080118-17-06	Resources	Watershed	Wildlife	Identification of all sites where system roads and trails – including newly designated routes – intersect or impinge on surface water resources. Roads and their associated effects (i.e. increased sedimentation loads) can have a range of deleterious impacts on aquatic resources, among them degradation of spawning beds and declines in populations of invertebrate organisms that are key components of the salmonid diet.	
225	080117-04-02	Resources	Watershed		I encourage maximum protection of watersheds, riparian zones, and water quality--water is an incredibly important resource, not only to the Sierra Nevada, but to the entire state of California.	1
226	080108-01-03	Resources	Watershed		Our watersheds are another important resource in our forests. Vehicles of any kind cause erosion and damage to the rivers. Limiting the number and length of roads obviously would lessen the impact and damage.	5
227	080110-04-03	Resources	Watershed		These unregulated vehicles are held to much lower pollution standards and frequently leave trails of oil and fuel that will inevitably leach into the ecosystem's fragile water supply.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
228	080109-02-04	Resources	Watershed		Many hiking trails have been re-located out of meadows because the wearing away of turf by many footsteps was found to increase erosion and lower the water table. OHV can place far greater impact than hikers on these fragile meadows. No OHV travel should be allowed in meadows.	
229	080114-02-01	Resources	Wildlife	Air Quality	I ask that you limit OHV routes as far as your capacity to do so. These vehicles cause harm to all types of biological organisms large and small. They can wreck havoc on forest ecosystem. And, importantly OHVs are contributors to CO2 increase which is a serious issue.	4
230	080104-02-01	Resources	Wildlife	Close Routes	I urge the Forest Service to close any dead-end or unneeded road segments and ANY roads that cut through sensitive wildlife areas; close All roads and routes in critical winter deer range areas especially Deer Ck and Jawbone.	
231	080122-29-17	Resources	Wildlife	Close Routes	One method the I.D. Team can use to protect at-risk wildlife is to designate as closed all unauthorized OHV routes that run through PACs or other important wildlife areas to any significant degree. Table 2 in Appendix A contains a list of all new previously-unauthorized OHV routes proposed to be designated in spotted owl PAC's. We ask that each of these routes be officially closed and that these unauthorized routes not be added to the already extensive road and route system that exceeds road and route density criteria for wildlife values. SEE LIST	
232	080118-17-03	Resources	Wildlife	Close Routes	Therefore we request that the EIS consider the possible adverse effects of existing, and proposed newly authorized, OHV routes on trout and deer habitat, populations, and fishing and hunting opportunities in the Stanislaus NF, and that presently unauthorized user-created OHV routes be closed and reclaimed wherever there is potential to cause significant degradation of habitat or the backcountry fishing or hunting experience.	
233	080109-05-01	Resources	Wildlife	Conflicts	All terrain vehicles go everywhere and ruin the place for wildlife and other users who expect the peace and quality of nature that forest lands were preserved to provide.	5
234	080108-12-01	Resources	Wildlife	Conflicts	I am writing to express opposition to the proposal to open more roads and allow more off road travel by motorized vehicles in the STF. Further destruction of this national treasure, deaths of vulnerable animals, noise and air pollution would be the result.	5
235	080102-01-02	Resources	Wildlife	Cross-country Travel	Roads and trail through sensitive wildlife areas should be closed during the winter, and driving off roads should be banned except for camping a few feet from the road.	5
236	071212-01-02	Resources	Wildlife	Fire	We might also point out that many of the current legal trails within the forest have not been monitored for environmental damage since their creation, so how will 142.5 miles (that's' almost the distance to San Francisco Bay) added to the existing backlog be properly managed? Legitimizing more routes will only create more opportunities for further degradation, fire starts and wildlife disruption.	5
237	080117-10-01	Resources	Wildlife	Heritage Resources	As you stated in your background information, unmanaged OHV and SUV usage in the wilderness 'has resulted in erosion, watershed and habitat degradation and impacts to cultural resource sites...compaction and erosion and vulnerable riparian areas and aquatic dependent species are particularly threatened.'	5
238	080118-06-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	Due to a large unfunded road maintenance backlog, many miles of forest roads should be closed including: 1) those which are dead-ends of less than 1.2 mile unless serving a specific purpose; 2) low priority roads within winter deer range areas or PAC's if road density is a 2 miles/square mile or greater; and those roads identified as unclassified or unauthorized in previous or current forest road inventories. These roads should be blocked/gated or signed to prevent unauthorized access.	1
239	080108-05-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	I urge you to not designate unauthorized routes and to close or decommission NFS roads based on roads/trails within winter deer range areas, if road density in those polygons is a 2 miles/sq mile or greater, and roads/trails that intersect federally TES species critical habitat, and roads/trails that are in proposed wilderness area, roadless areas, existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, montane meadows, and meadow management zones.	2
240	080115-02-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	I urge you to not designate unauthorized routes and to close or decommission NFS roads based on roads/trails within winter deer range areas, if road density in those polygons is a 2 miles/sq mile or greater, and roads/trails that intersect federally TES species critical habitat, and roads/trails that are in proposed wilderness area, roadless areas, existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, montane meadows, and meadow management zones.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
241	080115-02-05	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	The density of roads and trails on the forest disrupts wildlife, degrades habitat, and makes it increasingly difficult to find a place to enjoy the sounds of nature.	5
242	080122-16-04	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	Close/decommission low priority roads within winter deer range areas or PACs if road density in those polygons is at 2 miles/sq. mile or greater (allow exceptions where FS identifies a high resource or administrative need). For the Deer Creek and Jawbone winter deer range areas, seasonally close all road and OHV routes from December 1 through April 30.	
243	080122-29-13	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	At this time, the combined road and OHV route density within the Deer Creek winter range polygon as shown on the MiWok District OHV route designation map is over 6 mi/sq.mi. This is a significant and unavoidable negative impact that should clearly lead to strong mitigation such as road closure/decommissioning, OHV route closure/decommissioning, winter closure of roads and routes, and extreme care in choosing to keep open any roads or routes within this area.	
244	080122-13-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	I urge you to not designate unauthorized routes and to close or decommission National Forest roads based on the following criteria: - Roads/trails within winter deer range areas, if road density in those polygons is at 2 miles/sq mile or greater	
245	080108-14F-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	I urge you to not designate unauthorized routes and to close or decommission NFS roads based on roads/trails within winter deer range areas, if road density in those polygons is a 2 miles/sq mile or greater, and roads/trails that intersect federally TES species critical habitat, and roads/trails that are in proposed wilderness area, roadless areas, existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, montane meadows, and meadow management zones.	
246	080109-07-03	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	I urge you to not designate unauthorized routes and to close or decommission NFS roads based on roads/trails within winter deer range areas, if road density in those polygons is a 2 miles/sq mile or greater, and roads/trails that intersect federally TES species critical habitat, and roads/trails that are in proposed wilderness area, roadless areas, existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, montane meadows, and meadow management zones.	
247	080114-07-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	I urge you to not designate unauthorized routes and to close or decommission NFS roads based on roads/trails within winter deer range areas, if road density in those polygons is a 2 miles/sq mile or greater, and roads/trails that intersect federally TES species critical habitat, and roads/trails that are in proposed wilderness area, roadless areas, existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, montane meadows, and meadow management zones.	
248	080114-08-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	I urge you to not designate unauthorized routes and to close or decommission NFS roads based on roads/trails within winter deer range areas, if road density in those polygons is a 2 miles/sq mile or greater, and roads/trails that intersect federally TES species critical habitat, and roads/trails that are in proposed wilderness area, roadless areas, existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, montane meadows, and meadow management zones.	
249	080117-09-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	I urge you to not designate unauthorized routes and to close or decommission NFS roads based on roads/trails within winter deer range areas, if road density in those polygons is a 2 miles/sq mile or greater, and roads/trails that intersect federally TES species critical habitat, and roads/trails that are in proposed wilderness area, roadless areas, existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, montane meadows, and meadow management zones.	
250	080110-06-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	I urge you to not designate unauthorized routes and to close or decommission NFS roads based on roads/trails within winter deer range areas, if road density in those polygons is a 2 miles/sq mile or greater, and roads/trails that intersect federally TES species critical habitat, and roads/trails that are in proposed wilderness area, roadless areas, existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, montane meadows, and meadow management zones.	
251	080109-06-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	I urge you to not designate unauthorized routes and to close or decommission NFS roads based on roads/trails within winter deer range areas, if road density in those polygons is a 2 miles/sq mile or greater, and roads/trails that intersect federally TES species critical habitat, and roads/trails that are in proposed wilderness area, roadless areas, existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, montane meadows, and meadow management zones.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
252	080108-13-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	I urge you to not designate unauthorized routes and to close or decommission NFS roads based on roads/trails within winter deer range areas, if road density in those polygons is a 2 miles/sq mile or greater, and roads/trails that intersect federally TES species critical habitat, and roads/trails that are in proposed wilderness area, roadless areas, existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, montane meadows, and meadow management zones.	
253	080108-08-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	I urge you to not designate unauthorized routes and to close or decommission roads/trails within: winter deer range areas, if density in those polygons is at 2 miles/sq mile or greater; roads/trails that intersect federally TES critical habitat and habitat of sensitive wildlife species; roads/trails that are in proposed Wilderness areas, agency-inventoried roadless areas, proposed and existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, mountain meadows, and meadow management zones.	
254	080108-07-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	I urge you to not designate unauthorized routes and to close or decommission roads/trails within: winter deer range areas, if density in those polygons is at 2 miles/sq mile or greater; roads/trails that intersect federally TES critical habitat and habitat of sensitive wildlife species; roads/trails that are in proposed Wilderness areas, agency-inventoried roadless areas, proposed and existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, mountain meadows, and meadow management zones.	
255	080122-29-04	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	In response to this concern, our Center proposes several criteria that we urge the Forest to use to reduce motorized routes for a variety of beneficial reasons. Our Center has focused on sensitive wildlife areas as one highly important criteria for adopting certain route and road closures throughout the forest. Our single highest specific concern is the extremely high road and route density in critical winter deer ranges, particularly the Deer Creek area. However, we also focus our concern on the high road density in spotted owl and goshawk Protected Activity Centers PACs, as well as road disturbance in known or designated furbearer territories, as another criteria filter for assigning road or route closures. Our recommendations in these comments are based on published broad range of scientific literature that suggests specific management objectives for road densities in important wildlife habitat and that values the establishment of buffer areas to prevent disrupting at-risk sensitive wildlife species.	
256	080122-29-12	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	Pointing to the District's own planning product, we again reiterate this management objective to maintain a maximum road/motorized route density of 2 miles per square mile as the upper level of desired condition within critical winter deer range.	
257	080122-29-09	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	Reduce road density and OHV route density mileage to less than 3 miles of motorized road/route per square mile in all winter deer range polygons, spotted owl PACs, goshawk PACs, and furbearer territories by applying the following filter: Where the current combined road and route density exceeds the desired condition, identify the main roads within the polygons, furbearer territory, and PACs that are essential or preferable for retention, then the next most important roads, and on down until reaching the target density of less than 3 mi/sq mi. If all roads can be retained within the winter deer range polygons, furbearer territories, and PACs and the target density has not been exceeded, then allow OHV routes to be approved within these key wildlife areas, but only if the combined total road/route density can be kept below desired road density targets. As with roads, identify the highest priority OHV routes for approved use – then the next priority routes, etc.	
258	080109-02-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	We urge you to close and decommission existing NFS routes in these categories: All routes in Inventoried Roadless Areas, proposed wilderness areas, and Wild and Scenic River corridors (existing or proposed); Routes within deer winter range where road density exceeds 2 miles/sq. mile; Routes that cross or border on critical habitat for endangered and threatened species or California sensitive species.	
259	080122-29-10	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	While not as simple as the first two criteria, the application of this criteria filter to the winter deer range polygons, furbearer territories, and PACs would significantly reduce the amount of motorized disturbance within areas that have been specifically established as priority areas for the protection of at-risk wildlife. The Forest will be hard-pressed to justify approving or exceeding 3 mi/sq mi of road density in any such areas unless there are essential site-specific reasons to justify higher motorized disturbance levels. CSERC strongly supports for a much lower target density of <2 mi/sq mi, but we put forward the 3 mi/sq mi maximum as a middle ground policy solution.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
260	080116-11-05	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	Close or decommission all low priority roads within winter deer range areas or PACs if road density in those polygons is at 2 miles/sq mile or greater. (For example, according to Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center, the critical winter deer range at Deer Creek has a road density of 3.96 miles/sq. mile, and an OHV route density of 3.64 miles/sq. mile, for a total density of 7.6 miles/sq. mile. This is almost four times greater than the upper level of desired road density of 2 miles/sq. mile as identified in the Central Stanislaus Watershed Analysis, and needs to be addressed. Allow exceptions where the Forest identifies a high resource or administrative need.	
261	080125-01-01	Resources	Wildlife	Road Density	I urge you to not designate unauthorized routes and to close or decommission NFS roads based on roads/trails within winter deer range areas, if road density in those polygons is a 2 miles/sq mile or greater, and roads/trails that intersect federally TES species critical habitat, and roads/trails that are in proposed wilderness area, roadless areas, existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, montane meadows, and meadow management zones.	
262	080109-02-07	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	A seasonal closure should be adopted for all roads and trails in the Deer Creek and Jawbone deer winter range from November 15 to April 30 each year.	5
263	080104-01-02	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	All roads within winter deer range areas, such as Deer Ck and Jawbone, should be closed from November 15 through April 30 to reduce disturbance to the deer herds.	5
264	080117-07-05	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Also, please be specific in specifying critical animal/wildlife habitats and winter deer range areas, and please close all roads and routes in these areas to motorized travel during the prime impact periods such as winter migrations from November 15 th to April 30 th , including the Jawbone and Deer Creek areas.	5
265	080116-03-03	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Clearly the Jawbone and Deer Creek winter deer ranges should be closed during the critical winter period.	5
266	080114-02-02	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Deer Creek and Jawbone areas are particularly important as winter range. During the winter, especially between November 14th and April 30th the forest Service should CLOSE ALL ROADS.	5
267	080118-08-04	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Deer winterizing areas should be off limits to OHVs all year to clearly protect wildlife and prevent law enforcement problems.	5
268	080114-05-02	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Give the forest a seasonal chance to recover by closing all roads and routes in in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5
269	071226-01-04	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	I urge the STF to seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas, which are Deer Creek and Jawbone, from Nov. 15th through April 30th. This is one of the most significant needs for wildlife.	5
270	080108-05-04	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	I urge you to seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Ck and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5
271	080108-06-01	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	I urge you to seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Ck and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5
272	080110-01	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	I write this plea for the plants and animals who have a home in this forest. Please close the Deer Creek and Jawbone area from Nov.15th to April 30th. We need a quiet safe environment. Noise and gasoline bother us.	5
273	080119-01-02	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonal motorized closure for wintering deer should be at least 15Nov-30Apr, and extended as needed for additional wet conditions if present. This should include all routes (roads and trails) east and north of Italian Bar Road of the Mi-wok District (MD). It is not clear why only a shorter "wet season" designation is proposed for many routes in that area, but it appears the MD has proposed disowning the wintering deer herd, unlike the Groveland District.	5
274	080102-04-02	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in the critical winter deer range areas, especially the Deer Creek and jawbone areas from November 15th to April 30th.	5
275	080109-11-04	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5
276	080114-07-04	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
277	080114-08-04	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5
278	080115-02-04	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5
279	080108-07-03	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5
280	080108-13-04	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5
281	080108-08-02	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5
282	080108-14F-04	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5
283	080109-06-03	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5
284	080125-01-04	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5
285	080110-06-03	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5
286	080117-09-04	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th.	5
287	080116-05-06	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in winter deer ranges, especially Deer Creek and Jawbone, from November 15th through April 30th.	5
288	080110-02-03	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	The Forest Service had a policy of closing unpaved forest roads in winter, dating back to the 1920's and appearing in the annual Secretary of Agriculture reports. The FS ought to revisit the prerogative of seasonal closures with all roads in critical wildlife areas, such as the winter mule deer range.	5
289	080122-29-25	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	There would be seasonal closures of all but absolutely essential roads and OHV routes within critical winter deer range areas, as collaboratively agreed to by the Forest, the Department of Fish and Game, and local deer experts. For analysis purposes, current polygon areas from Route Designation maps would be the basis for such seasonal closures.	5
290	080117-03-04	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	We favor a season closure of all routes in the Deer Creek and Jawbone deer winter range areas from November 15 to April 30 each year.	5
291	080122-05-01	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	We urge you to close all roads in the area of critical winter deer habitat. The ongoing destruction of wildlife habitat on private land by clearcut logging makes it more important than ever that animals on public lands be protected to a greater degree than ever before.	5
292	080118-06-03	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	All roads and OHV routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Ck and Jawbone) should be seasonally closed since deer numbers have dropped over recent decades and disturbance can frequently stress deer during critical cold periods or when does are heavy with fawns.	
293	080122-29-15	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	For the presently defined Deer Creek basin, CSERC urges that 3N58, 4N16, and all OHV routes within the winter deer range polygon boundaries be closed from November 1st (or at the very latest, November 15th) until April 30th. Our Center urges the Forest to clearly sign and gate those roads and routes, requiring closure to all OHV and motorized vehicles and employing traffic-control gates and posted barriers on routes to ensure consistent compliance.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
294	080122-29-16	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	It is vital that the Forest officially set a seasonal closure for all the spur roads and routes off of 3N58 and 4N16 within the Deer Creek basin to effectively shut down motorized use in the Deer Creek area for the prolonged winter season. Additionally, we emphasize that the seasonal closure should be extended from November 1st (or no later than November 15th) through April 30th to allow for protection of over wintering deer for the entire season, not just the majority of the season. In many years, most of the wintering deer are on the winter range by the middle of November and may not leave for the summer range until late May[1]. It is especially important to extend the seasonal closure beyond late winter into spring because deer fat reserves are at their lowest in the late winter-early spring period and any increased energy expenditure can have significant consequences.	
295	080116-11-07	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Let me urge the Stanislaus Forest to seasonally close ALL roads and OHV routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th. Deer numbers have dropped in recent years, so this could be an extremely critical benefit for wildlife. Disturbance from vehicles can stress deer during critical cold periods or when does are heavy with fawns. High road density and wildlife disturbing OHV use in the critical winter deer range is a pivotally important issue, especially in the Deer Creek Rose Creek basin.	
296	080108-01-02	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Roads are an intrusion on the lives of animals in the forest. Not only noise, but disturbance of vegetation affects wildlife. This is even more critical in the winter when animals are stressed just to survive. Please consider closing all roads in winter deer range areas during the winter.	
297	080118-17-05	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonal closures of unpaved roads and trails during winter months (wet weather) and/or during peak game migration periods to reduce erosion and sedimentation, maintenance costs, and disturbance of wildlife.	
298	080102-05-03	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close ALL roads and routes in the critical winter deer range areas, especially the Deer Creek and Jawbone areas from November 15th to April 30th. You must realize that the Deer Ck. Road density (total density over 6 miles per square mile, if you add regular road density to the OHV route density of 3 m.p.s.m.) is more than three times the upper level of desired road density of 2 m.p.s.m. that the FS uses as a target!	
299	080118-05-02	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Seasonally close all roads and routes in the two most affected winter deer range areas (Deer Creek and Jawbone) from November 15th through April 30th. The Deer Creek area has a much greater concentration of roads per sq/mile that the upper level density target the FS tries to attain.	
300	080111-02-04	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Some roads need to be closed seasonally for resource protection; specifically winter closures to protect roads from being damaged and critical seasonal closures to protect wildlife. Examples include winter deer range and bird nesting such as owls at other times of the year.	
301	080117-11-03	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	Street Legal vehicles should be allowed only on roads. Motorized vehicles should not be allowed off designated routes further than is required to park. Close all low priority roads within winter deer range areas or PAC's. Seasonally close all roads and routes in winter deer ranges, especially Deer Creek and Jawbone, from November 15th through April 30th.	
302	080122-29-14	Resources	Wildlife	Seasonal Closures	The proposed action as now defined by the Forest indicates that two main roads running through the length of the Deer Creek area, 3N58 and 4N16, would be seasonally closed from December 1 to April 1. This is positive, but is arguably not near enough to prevent significant detrimental impacts to the declining Stanislaus Deer Herd. It would still result in OHV use within the affected area throughout the long fall period and in mid-spring, causing disturbance and stress to wintering deer as well as other wintering wildlife species. It would still mean that during fall seasons with early storms or early fall cold spells, OHV use and motorized use (including road-hunting by late fall poachers), would still be occurring along both 3N58 and 4N16 and their spur roads.	
303	080116-11-02	Resources	Wildlife	Sensitive Plants	The Forest Service must consider how any new motorized route they add to their travel system contributes to the problem of fragmenting habitat for wildlife. (Since wildlife cannot speak up for themselves, the Forest Service must take special care to assure that providing for human recreation minimizes the harm to wildlife, both plants and animals.) Special concern must be given to sensitive species.	5
304	080108-11-02	Resources	Wildlife	Vegetation	Vehicles of this nature do not afford their occupants wildland experiences. They ruin that possibility with noise and pollution. It is insensitive to believe that wildlife and wild plants can prosper where such activity degrades their habitat.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
305	080111-07-03	Resources	Wildlife	Watershed	We are concerned that the proposed action adds currently unauthorized OHV routes to the transportation system in habitat for sensitive wildlife species in roadless areas, in critical aquatic refuges, in fragile meadow areas, and in areas proposed as Wild and Scenic Rivers.	5
306	080117-04-03	Resources	Wildlife	Watershed	I am an avid birdwatcher and encourage the protection of great owl habitat, namely meadows between 3,000 and 8000' elevation. I have seen great gray owls in Ackerson Meadow and have seen habitat improvements in the Wilson Meadow area, and encourage closing roads in these areas to all vehicles.	5
307	080122-27-10	Resources	Wildlife		Avoid harassment of wildlife and significant disruption of wildlife habitat.	5
308	080122-28-10	Resources	Wildlife		Avoid harassment of wildlife and significant disruption of wildlife habitat.	5
309	080117-14	Resources	Wildlife		I am writing to support the limitation of OHV roads and trails in our forests. I understand you mean to keep areas open for the use of motorized vehicles which contain wildlife and nature trails. My feeling is that this will not only squeeze out the wildlife that needs this habitat to survive, but will deprive us human beings of the natural experience that we all require to live our lives in a truly natural, human way. There is precious-little true wildlife left on this planet due to our intrusion into its habitat, and few places we can go to experience that wildlife or the peace and solitude that keeps us, ourselves, from becoming "wild". (In my view, OHV riders are a flagrant example of humans gone "wild".)	5
310	071221-03-01	Resources	Wildlife		I have concern that winter deer routes and over wintering sites are not being attended to in the route designations. In light of data from CAL Fish/Game on poaching rates and other information about deer populations in the Stanislaus herd, a plan should include deer information in road and route planning.	5
311	080122-21-01	Resources	Wildlife		I realize that not all off-roading enthusiasts are yahoos and renegades, but the off-roaders around us at the workshop were openly mocking the idea of protecting threatened or endangered species. They seemed to be clueless that the spotted owl, yellow-legged frog, elderberry beetle and others are indicator species that reveal the health or lack of health of forest ecosystems. These are not people who should be allowed to trample far and wide.	5
312	071123-01-04	Resources	Wildlife		OHV harassment can be significant detriment to wildlife. This is especially true in winter months when food is scarce and energy-demanding flight from danger is the least affordable, but it is also true at other times of the year.	5
313	071221-01-01	Resources	Wildlife		Please- less OHV roads and more protection for our wildlife and resources.	5
314	080109-07-01	Resources	Wildlife		Roads through forests disrupt species directly and indirectly. The OHVs on roads create noise and they interfere with migrations and cause stress. And reduce the viability so species as well as make otherwise important habitats unusable for wildlife nesting, roosting, rearing young and the like. Adding more roads to the forest system decreases the habitat value for creatures and organisms that depend upon the forest for their lives.	5
315	080119-01-05	Resources	Wildlife		Sensitive forest resources (e.g. special status species and habitats) must be protected and not further compromised or sacrificed for motorized recreation.	5
316	080108-09-01	Resources	Wildlife		Sure the animals need help, but the help they need is for human beings to stop breeding like rabbits. It is human overpopulation that causes all the other animals to be in danger of extinction as well as the human race.	5
317	080118-22-03	Resources	Wildlife		the need to provide opportunities for motorized and non-motorized recreation within the carrying capacity of the land (minimizing damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, cultural sites, and other resources of the public lands; and minimizing harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats).	5
318	0801-09-08	Resources	Wildlife		The potential hazard to wildlife in the area is of great importance, and hopefully this will override the fact that someone stands to make financial gain as a result of the proposed land-use.	5
319	080122-27-09	Resources	Wildlife		This area is a sensitive wildlife area home to the Railroad Flat Deer herd and with known goshawk and spotted owl nesting sites.	5
320	080122-28-09	Resources	Wildlife		This area is a sensitive wildlife area home to the Railroad Flat Deer herd and with known goshawk and spotted owl nesting sites.	5
321	071126-03-03	Resources	Wildlife		To continue to cater to their "wants" only opens up the forests to further abuse and destruction of the environment as well as wildlife.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
322	080111-01-01	Resources	Wildlife		What's will be needed in the future is more wild areas that preserve habitat and serves as a sanctuary for the soil too.	5
323	080109-09-01	Resources	Wildlife		Roads should not be permitted within winter deer range areas or federally TES critical habitat and habitat of California sensitive wildlife species.	5
324	080123-01-02	Resources	Wildlife		Off-road vehicle use creates enormous challenges to effective stewardship of our public lands. The propensity for OHV users to impact wildlife and the public has been well demonstrated. Equally disturbing to me, is the willingness of OHV users to create and use trails throughout the forest. It angers me that the Forest Service now plans to reward this rogue behavior by adopting many of these routes into the Motorized Travel Plan.	
325	080118-12-04	Routes	Add Routes	Camping	I believe that there should be a provision included for preservation and maintenance of the four wheel drive/OHV trails currently designated and that it should allow for future growth and expansion as pressure on our present trail network increases. These areas should be open for multiple uses and where ever possible, existing roads or user created trails should be used to create trail loops which would enhance the off-highway experience and relieve congestion. Dispersed camping opportunities should be maintained to ensure that a quality outdoor experience can be had by all.	
326	080115-04-01	Routes	Add Routes	Difficulty Rating	The main concern we have is the lack of real 4 wheel drive trails in the forest. When considering the MiWuk and Summit Districts, we have the Niagara Rim trail as the only true 4--wheel drive trail. At the Road Designation meeting on Nov. 29, 2007, the subject of a replacement for closed Argo trail was brought up. We hope this topic can be moved forward in the near future. SEE LIST	1
327	080110-05-01	Routes	Add Routes	Difficulty Rating	The main concern we have is the lack of real 4 wheel drive trails in the forest. When considering the MiWuk and Summit Districts, we have the Niagara Rim trail as the only true 4--wheel drive trail. At the Road Designation meeting on Nov. 29, 2007, the subject of a replacement for closed Argo trail was brought up. We hope this topic can be moved forward in the near future. SEE LIST	1
328	071127-01-03	Routes	Add Routes	Events	Deer Creek - section 23: need a connector from Deer Creek up and over ridge to access proposed routes west of Lyons Reservoir area. There are several existing routes. MDR is asking that we designate one route, at least for event/permit only use. Keeping one access route open to general public use may also help to mitigate conflicts with private land off of 4N02. This area was not inventoried as the base map showed it to be private property. It is Forest Service land, however.	
329	080122-01-01	Routes	Add Routes	Heritage Resources	It has been brought to my attention by members of a local historical group that trails and roads of historical significance have not been included in the Route Designation Inventory. These trails and roads are part of the American heritage and of archeological importance. I would like to request that the Forest Service review of historical routes that pass through the STF boundaries. In addition, I believe that access to these community Assets be included in the EIS inventory.	1
330	071222-01-02	Routes	Add Routes	Heritage Resources	If any route in the Groveland District were at one time part of the Yosemite Lumber Co Railroad, I would like them to remain open to public travel.	
331	080116-08-02	Routes	Add Routes	Local Economy	FS. OHV Park at Date Flat. All usage to be directed to the East. This area is a joint use area between the FS and BLM. This area has a 20- year history of use with permanent rest rooms built in 2004 with funds acquired from OHV green sticker fees. This area is used by hundred of annual visitors, which benefits our local businesses greatly.	1
332	080118-01-01	Routes	Add Routes	Local Economy	As the owner of the Historic Hotel Jeffery in Coulterville, the proposed closure of our local area Date Flat would seriously impact our Economics in this region in a negative manner.	5
333	080122-10-06	Routes	Add Routes	Maintenance	Rather than legitimizing a large dispersed system of trails and roads that is difficult to manage, consider starting with a smaller system that you are currently capable of managing, then if resources increase add routes as they can be managed. Efficiency of management would suggest a less dispersed system of trails.	
334	071127-01-08	Routes	Add Routes	Maps	Mapping error - 4N61 & 4N31. As currently mapped, a short piece of administrative access only prevents users from making the connection from 4N61 to 4N39	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
335	080118-21-08	Routes	Add Routes	Minimum System	Retain a minimum of forest roads needed to manage the forest, provide fire protection, and allow public access to camping areas and other sites of interest. The definition given in the TMFR for a forest road or trail is one "...that the Forest Service determines is necessary for the protection, administration, and utilization of the National Forest System and the use and development of its resources."	1
336	080117-02-03	Routes	Add Routes	Parking	No illegally created trails should be included in the new designated system, and vehicles should not be allowed off of any designated road or trail except just far enough to park safely.	5
337	080118-12-01	Routes	Add Routes	Right of Way	I must really be confused as it appears to me from reviewing the map that nearly all of the Forest Roads between Summit Level Road and the North Fork of the Mokelumne River (6Nxx/7Nxx roads in and around the Blue Mountain/Winton Road/Bailey Ridge area) are highlighted in red which appears to mean "No Public Access". If I am reading the map/legend correctly this is totally unacceptable. If this mass closure is due to rights of way issues with Sierra Pacific Industries or other logging companies then every effort should be made to secure passage for the public.	1
338	080116-09-02	Routes	Add Routes	Right of Way	The 4X4 road that goes around the private property parcel at Lake Alpine needs to be reopened, to mitigate the right of way issue.	
339	080123-01-05	Routes	Add Routes	Road Density	As for the troubling issue of adding 126.2 miles of user made unauthorized routes to the designated trail system, I urge a more conservative approach. The USFS should be sure that road and trail densities will not be in excess of two miles per square mile.	
340	080102-02-01	Routes	Add Routes	Safety	Please include 5N75 (old Board's Crossing Road) in your assessment of Public Wheeled Motorized Travel. Although 5N02 (Sour Grass road-paved) makes travel to the N. Fork of the Stanislaus River comfortable, if it were to become blocked, there would be a major safety issue. The road enables travel from Calaveras Co. to Tuolumne Co. In the past, the element of fire, the flooding of the sour Grass Area, and other assorted situations have made 5N75 (the dirt connector route) the only road to enable them to get back to Calaveras County. Concern for public safety dictates a need to repair the Board's Crossing Bridge and 5N75. SEE LIST	
341	071221-02-01	Routes	Add Routes	User Conflicts	One or two motorcycles zipping up and down a narrow canyon trail can drown a picnicking family in the dust and exhaust; can scare birds or wildlife away....; can be dangerous to equestrians or mt. bikers. The noise of these vehicles alone affects virtually every other person attempting to enjoy that same canyon or trail, not to mention its effects on wildlife. While OHV use is still a minor activity on our national forests, its impact on the forest and its users is disproportionately major. For these reason, we are concerned that the proposed action would add considerably more roads and trails to the current transportation system...	
342	071213-01-01	Routes	Add Routes	User Conflicts	Please do not reroute or change any of usage designation of the trails that are currently in the STF area. I'm very much concerned with the possibility of redesigning trails for use for hikers and other non-motorized activities. The concern I have is for an accident to happen between a motorized participate and a non-motorized person's.	
343	080116-10-02	Routes	Add Routes	Vehicle Type	My specific criticism is the proposed closure of road 4N49Y.....offers an excellent vista of Bell Meadows. This trail has stabilized since it was created as a logging road, and is an excellent opportunity for an OHV only trail. The lower portion of the main Bell Mt. road 4N50Y is actually best suited for ATV travel due to the rocky condition of the roadbed.	
344	071127-01-06	Routes	Add Routes		4N39: map currently shows proposal to close road to all but administrative use. Mike expressed concern over this proposal. Beth explained that the proposal on this map was consistent with a separate planning effort being done on the Summit District. A decision has not yet been made	1
345	071213-03-01	Routes	Add Routes		My family and friends would like to keep the OHV trails we have, but have seen certain groups claiming new rights to the NF that exclude our four wheel drive recreation.	1
346	080122-08-02	Routes	Add Routes		There are several spur trails along the "Mather trail" that lead to day use areas on the middle fork of the Tuolumne River and marked as decommissioned on the CD. Instead of closing these spots could you instead sign it for no camping, no campfires and vehicles within say 100 ft of the river? SEE LIST	1

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
347	071219-06-01	Routes	Add Routes		The BLM proposal to eliminate all OHV routes starting from the USFS Date Flat Park area which ties into the BLM Tim Brush Fuel break and North fork area has created much concern. This staging area and trails are used by hundreds of OHV users annually. The businesses in Coulterville and Greeley Hill benefit greatly from the people that use the park and trails and such action will have a significant economic impact that we feel has not been adequately addressed by the BLM.	2
348	080116-09-01	Routes	Add Routes		There should be no roads or trails closed or their use restricted due to any part of this process. All previously open trails that have been closed without due process should be open for recreation. There should be increased opportunity for motorized users. The creation of 2 Wilderness Areas on the Stanislaus has displaced all the motorized users into a very small geographic area.	2
349	080118-02-03	Routes	Add Routes		We, as senior citizens, uses ATV's as transportation in the forest, traveling on existing roads and trails only. By restricting our ATV use, we will have to venture into these proposed closure areas with our street legal vehicle's, which are heavier and will cause more road damage.	4
350	080122-20-01	Routes	Add Routes		Concerning Action Item #1 – I agree with proposed action item #1: Adding 126.2 miles of existing trails to the National Forest System of trails open to wheeled motorized use.	5
351	080122-20-03	Routes	Add Routes		Action Item #4 – I support the action to change approximately 11.6 miles of existing NFS roads closed to wheeled use to NFS roads open to public wheeled motorized use.	5
352	080122-20-04	Routes	Add Routes		Action Item #5 – I Oppose the proposed action to change approximately 24.5 miles of NFS roads open to public wheeled motorized use to NFS roads closed to public wheeled use.	5
353	080122-20-02	Routes	Add Routes		Concerning Action Item #3: I agree with proposed action #3: Convert approximately 17 miles of existing National Forest System roads to NFS trails open to wheeled motorized use.	5
354	080122-20-05	Routes	Add Routes		We support the proposed action #6: change approximately 73.7 miles of NFS roads from open to highway legal only uses to NFS roads open to all public wheeled motorized use.	5
355	080128-01-02	Routes	Add Routes		We support the statements of purpose and need listed in 2.1., 2.2 and A through K, to develop an environmentally sound transportation system that supports the forest and public needs. However we strongly feel that the forest has not provided the science, analysis and field review to validate and rationally justify the need for such drastic road and trail closures as is displayed in the Proposed Action.	5
356	080122-01-04	Routes	Add Routes		It has been brought to my attention that trails and roads in the STF used by the Gold Prospectors Association of America and the Lost Dutchmen's Mine Association have not been included in the Route Designation Inventory. As a large user of the forest system, it was the responsibility of the STF to notify. I would request that these organizations be given an appropriate period of time to properly map and present to the STF trails and roads that are imperative to this form of recreation.	5
357	080122-10-03	Routes	Add Routes		Legitimizing illegally created routes will encourage the creation of more illegal routes by OHV users, and will tax existing resources to an even greater extent.	5
358	080117-10-02	Routes	Add Routes		With those negative issues recognized, it is difficult to understand the rationale for legalizing the use of admittedly illegal trails that have almost certainly caused the above problems.. Additionally, the proposal to significantly extend the mileage of roads and trails, creating newly invaded areas, defies logic.	5
359	080122-14-02	Routes	Add Routes		Has there been any study done to see how much these roads and trails are actually used. I realize that some parts of the Forest Parks are used more than others. There should be limits to trails around these parks. Limits not closures. I have all the respect in the world for anyone that lives along these roads, but because I ride by 1 house in a three or four mile stretch that is on my GPS I do not believe that I am a nuisance to them. I believe to shut down any road or trail in the Greeley Hill area is unwarranted. What percentage of any road or trail in Greeley Hill is traveled by an OHV at any 1 time 1%? Its probably not even that high.	5
360	080111-03-01	Routes	Add Routes		I am appalled at the way the Forest Service is closing down access to our forests. Please keep the forest open, wilderness is for the areas we can't get to anyway. Designate that!	5
361	071126-01-01	Routes	Add Routes		I support maintaining and keeping open the motorized trails, routes and various forest roads along the highway 4 corridor from the general area of White Pines to Bear Valley	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
362	080122-14-03	Routes	Add Routes		I would hope that any road that is up for closure you would please come out and travel it with us and anyone that wants it closed. We as riders that have ridden these trails for years hopefully will have an alternative to encircle the Greeley Hill area if any particular road or trail is closed.	5
363	071206-02-01	Routes	Add Routes		If there are tracks on a well worn trail, it is used. Please do not close it. The proposed closing of trails will only condense usage & increase trail damage.	5
364	071206-03-01	Routes	Add Routes		My comment to your travel plan is to have no motorized closures. Motorized off-road vehicles do not cause anymore damage than a group of horseback riders.	5
365	071206-02-05	Routes	Add Routes		Reopen old existing trails that connect to worthwhile destinations.	5
366	071218-01-01	Routes	Add Routes		The other "visitors" have their one third of the forest that is exclusively theirs plus they can use any part of the other two thirds that they have to share a very small part with "public wheeled motorized travel". No OHV routes should be eliminated just to allow other visitors non-motorized recreation opportunities"	5
367	080118-02-02	Routes	Add Routes		We feel the closure of existing roads and trails to OHVs because certain people have gone out of bounds with their vehicle is the wrong approach. Who is to say it is only the OHV user that is driving out of bounds. Many street legal vehicles can go just as many places as an OHV,	5
368	080118-22-06	Routes	Add Routes		What is the basis for your proposal to designate new motorized trails and areas in the proposal area and change the use categories for existing roads? How did you use Travel Analysis to assess the environmental and social impacts of the transportation system?	6
369	080122-20-10	Routes	Add Routes		I noticed that the following routes are to be eliminated from consideration based on the proposed action maps. A partial listing follows. We would appreciate receiving a complete list of routes that are to be removed from consideration as well as the reasons for this decision for each route as stated above. SEE LIST	
370	080116-08-01	Routes	Add Routes		Forest Service Rd 2S05: Moore Ck. (Buck Mews.)- Establish OHV staging area along Moore Creek and direct all OHV traffic to the East. This area is heavily used by all forest visitors and campers. SEE LIST	
371	071219-01-01	Routes	Add Routes		May be an attachment to Don Amador 080116-13. SEE LIST	
372	071129-01-01	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
373	071219-04-01	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
374	080109-01-01	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
375	080115-06-01	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
376	080116-02-01	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
377	080116-11-14	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
378	080116-13-01	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
379	080118-17-07	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
380	080116-07-01	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
381	080118-04-01	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
382	080118-19-01	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
383	080118-20-01	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
384	080122-30-01	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
385	080122-30-02	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
386	080122-30-03	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
387	080123-02-02	Routes	Add Routes		SEE LIST	
388	071210-01-02	Routes	Add Routes		I would like to discuss access from the top of mt. Elizabeth to South Fork road for licensed vehicles. The proposed maps closes a section of trail that would allow a loop to S. Fork without returning down Mt. Elizabeth to Middle Camp.	
389	080118-09-01	Routes	Add Routes		I would like to ask you not to close Roads 2S21 and 2S13 Y near McDermid Fire Station, Hotel and Dogtown Rd. We have ridden ATV and motorcycles there since the early 70's. We use these roads to get to the many single track trails in the area and to get out to the Date Flat riding area. SEE LIST	
390	071213-02-04	Routes	Add Routes		Please do no reroute or change any of usage designation of the trails that are currently in the STF, they are imperative for the motorized recreators to be able to have such a wonderful area to use.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
391	071219-05-03	Routes	Add Routes		Please do not reroute or change any of usage designation of the trails that are currently in the STF, they are imperative for the motorized recreators to be able to have such a wonderful area to use.	
392	071205-02-01	Routes	Add Routes		Rd. 7020 and 4N2Y- would like to see the motorized designation on these two changed to include green stickers motorcycles. Bell Meadow is a very favorite spot to visit.	
393	080122-08-01	Routes	Add Routes		The trail that parallels the paved Mather rode is marked as Decommissioned on the CD (color green)- this is an important and relatively heavily used trail that provides a connection for OHV riders in the Mather, Evergreen Lodge and Peachgrowers area to trails further west. Without this trail, OHV enthusiasts will have to illegally drive on the paved Mather road. I hope you do not decommission this.	
394	071205-02-04	Routes	Add Routes		These roads are open only to street legal. I would like to see them open to green sticker motorcycles. These are not high traffic roads and the motorcycle maintenance crews are keeping them free of fallen trees. 3N66 Bourland Rd; 3N20Y Box Springs; 3N21 Bourland Ck.; 3N22 Little Reynold; and 3N27.	
395	071205-02-03	Routes	Add Routes		Trail 17EV12 Boney Flat: This trail connects 3N86 on the lower side. This is a trail that is very low maintenance and has been in the system a long time and provides another loop.	
396	071205-02-02	Routes	Add Routes		Trail 4N504: This is a road that is very important. It leads to the top of Bell Mountain which has a wonderful view of the high mountains. As trail volunteers, we log out this road every spring. Please keep this open to OHV Green Sticker. SEE LIST	
397	071126-02-01	Routes	Add Routes		What is the reasoning behind the proposed closure of 17EV274 and 17EV275 in the Bear Trap/ Jelmini Basin area? These trails are an integral part of the local trail network and are valuable single track which are in short supply in this area. The trail is maintained by local riders who cleanup annual blowdown area. The trail is maintained by local riders who cleanup annual blowdown, etc.	
398	080128-01-01	Routes	Add Routes		The Proposed Action fails to meet the Purpose and Need by reducing existing dispersed recreation and riding opportunities by closing 53% of GPS routes; reducing access for these activities on over 37% of the road and trail system by restricting allowable uses or season of use; and closing 214 miles of system roads that are currently open to OHV motorized use.	
399	080128-01-03	Routes	Add Routes		Our review of the proposed changes to the transportation system has resulted in the following (17) comments. SEE LIST	
400	080118-12-02	Routes	Camping		Access to the North Fork of the Mokelumne River near White Azalea campground from Winton Road via 7N08 needs to be maintained for its recreational value as it allows county residents a wonderful off-highway experience while traveling to fishing and camping locations on the river and at Salt Springs Reservoir. Please do not make the last leg of this route to the river for "ML2-Administrative Use Only". If "Green Sticker" vehicle use is at issue then please at least maintain this as a "Street Legal" vehicle route.	
401	080109-11-05	Routes	Close Routes	Cross-country Travel	I am in opposition to the STF proposed action that would add over 126 miles of unauthorized off-road vehicle trails to the already unsustainable NFS system of roads and motorized trails, and would allow cross-country travel up to 100 ft of either side of designated roads and trails.	5
402	080114-10-01	Routes	Close Routes	Cross-country Travel	I am writing to express my opposition to the STF proposed action that would add over 126 miles of unauthorized OHV trails to the already unsustainable NFS of roads, and would allow cross-country travel up to 100 ft off either side of designated roads and trails.	5
403	080122-13-01	Routes	Close Routes	Cross-country Travel	I strongly oppose the Stanislaus National Forest Proposed Action that would add over 126 miles of unauthorized off-road vehicle trails to the already unsustainable National Forest system of roads and motorized trails, and would allow cross-country travel up to 100 feet off either side of designated roads and trails.	5
404	080118-21-06	Routes	Close Routes	Decommission	Close and decommission all unnecessary roads, recognizing that this is most cost effective. There is a very large backlog for road maintenance. Erosion from untended roads is causing environmental damage and threatening watercourses.	1
405	080116-11-06	Routes	Close Routes	Decommission	Close or decommission all road segments identified as unclassified or unauthorized in previous or current Forest road inventories, except where NEPA analysis has authorized specific segments to be included in the road system.	1

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
406	080122-16-05	Routes	Close Routes	Decommission	Close/decommission all road segments identified as unclassified or unauthorized in previous or current road inventories, except where a NEPA analysis authorizes segments to be included in road system.	1
407	080109-11-01	Routes	Close Routes	Decommission	I'm asking you to not designate unauthorized routes, and to close or decommission NFS roads. These roads will threaten TES critical habitat.	1
408	080114-02-03	Routes	Close Routes	Decommission	The Forest Service should decommission at least 1000 of the 3,415 miles that currently exist. No new roads should be added. Please drop the plan to add 126 new miles, the saved money should be used to fund law enforcement.	1
409	080116-05-03	Routes	Close Routes	Decommission	The Forest should close or decommission at least 1,000 miles of the approximately 3,415 miles of road now shown within the STF.	1
410	080122-10-08	Routes	Close Routes	Decommission	The Stanislaus National Forest has an unfunded road maintenance backlog and far more roads than it can manage. The Forest should close or decommission at least 1,000 miles of the approximately 3,415 miles of road now shown within the Stanislaus Forest.	
411	080118-08-08	Routes	Close Routes	Funding	All proposed plans must incorporate an obligation (monetarily and physical capability) to close and rehabilitate previous areas impacted by OHVs.	1
412	071206-01-02	Routes	Close Routes	Funding	I propose that some significant number of roads be closed to recreational use, say 50% more or less, to limit the maintenance cost for which there is not adequate budget.	1
413	080115-06-03	Routes	Close Routes	Funding	Further designation of forest roads for OHV use that are not already designated for use adds to the administrative burden of an agency that is chronically underfunded and understaffed. OHV use by the public comprises 15% of the recreational use, yet constitutes a much higher proportion of the impact on public lands; its forest, streams, soils and wildlife. Granting expanded OHV use either by extending miles of access or widening routes by allowing 200 feet corridors places even greater responsibility on those forest officials who are not in some case able to adequately enforce current regulations at present.	
414	080118-21-03	Routes	Close Routes	Maintenance	We ask that you consider the following recommendations as you devise alternatives for the DEIS: 1. Prior to finalizing any travel system, complete a GPS survey of the entire system, map all illegally created trails to be closed, and conduct a review of the soils and other relevant features of each proposed trail to ensure that all trails to be created are viable for the long term and do not require undue levels of maintenance.	
415	080102-06-02	Routes	Close Routes	Minimum System	We know that roads and trails that are not maintained damage the environment and threaten our water supplies. Please retain only the roads necessary for managing the forest and for allowing reasonable access to camp sites or hiking areas. Other roads should be closed and returned to a natural state. It is very clear that the FS cannot maintain the miles of roads proposed.	1
416	080118-18-05	Routes	Close Routes	Non-motorized	For routes that are proposed to be closed to motorized use in the future, we would like them to be considered to remain available for non-motorized uses. We understand that there will be a separate analysis and we would like to assist. We do not want trails closed in this analysis that have value to non-motorized users without a good reason for closure.	1
417	080127-01-01	Routes	Close Routes	Non-motorized	The key issue here is a basic sociological concept: just because a large number of people enjoy an obnoxious, destructive activity, this does not automatically convey the right to unregulated pursuit of that activity. I believe OHV use in the national forest should be very limited, leaving the great majority of these open spaces free of the sight and sound of internal combustion engines.	5
418	080122-14-04	Routes	Close Routes	Private Property	I am writing in regards to the proposal of an OHV Park on the ridge between Love Creek Road and McKays Dam road. Specifically forest roads 4N35, 5N5Y and 4NO4Y. As the potential buyer of what would essentially be the closest residence to this park (4024 Douds Lane) and a current resident of Love Creek Road, I am obviously deeply concerned. Specifically the dust and noise impact that this would have on both the subdivisions of Love Creek and Douds Landing as well as the fact that neither Love Creek Road nor Douds Landing Road are capable of supporting the additional traffic that this would generate.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
419	080119-01-08	Routes	Close Routes	Private Property	No further public access should be allowed on 4N02 from the county road through private land. The FS has utterly failed for years to adhere to easement conditions, to adequately regulate illegal uses despite repeated notifications of chronic violations, or to maintain that route. Nor has the MD followed through with their 5-year old proposal to restrict OHV further to the east to attempt to reduce impacts to private lands. We request that no OHV use be allowed on 4N02 west of 3N35.	
420	080130-03-01	Routes	Close Routes	Private Property	Re: the OHV park near Love Creek and McKay's Dam: There is a lot of hiking and walking traffic in the area. The residents are sensitive to the cultural aspects e.g., when the Avery-Hathaway Pines Community Plan was developed, they specifically left out some of the historic and cultural resources since they, the community members, did not want people "shopping" for treasures. I hope the USFS will consider NOT making this area an OHV destination.	
421	080117-12-05	Routes	Close Routes	Private Property	This current plan seems to be creating an area specifically designated for off-road vehicle use surrounding a residential area. Previous motorized use evaluations in the Arnold Interface area have not supported this type of designation. In fact the designations resulting from the Arnold Interface public comment process resulted in the opposite designation: elimination of OHV use near highly populated areas.	
422	080118-17-08	Routes	Close Routes	Roadless Areas	We recommend that all presently-unauthorized off-highway vehicle roads and trails that penetrate or could otherwise degrade an Inventoried Roadless Area, a Wild & Scenic River corridor, or sensitive wildlife or fish habitat, be permanently closed to all motorized travel (except for emergency purposes) and reclaimed as much as possible to a natural condition. Furthermore, we recommend that existing system motorized routes be evaluated under the forthcoming EIS for their effects on fish and game values, water sources, and backcountry hunting and fishing opportunities, and that designated routes which are degrading or could degrade these values be relocated, improved to mitigate adverse effects, or removed.	2
423	080122-29-19	Routes	Close Routes	Signing	In reality, a route or road will continue to be driven upon unless such a road or trail is given a management direction to be signed as closed, gated, blocked by a berm, or otherwise actually closed in some fashion that ensures that the public sees that the road or route is close – and thus recognizes the closure. Our Center asks that the Forest officially plan to sign and close all of these unauthorized and decommissioned roads and trails, so that it is clear to drivers or riders of vehicles as to which roads and routes are officially open and which are officially closed. This will ease confusion for motorized recreationists, as well as simplify enforcement for the Forest Service.	1
424	080108-01-01	Routes	Close Routes	User Conflicts	I hope you will consider the need for peace and quiet that hikers enjoy. I realize that OHV users need a place to enjoy their sport, but often that is at the expense of those who want peace and solitude and enjoyment of nature. A limited number of roads need to be set aside for OHV users, and other roads should be closed to such traffic.	5
425	080110-02-01	Routes	Close Routes	Watershed	Motor trail cut through vegetative filter zones in the forest and create pathways for direct sediment transfers to streams. Assessing the potential water quality impacts calls for an examination both on base flow and storm flows of streams. Please shut down a 1000 miles of unneeded road segments and roads that disturb sensitive wildlife and watershed areas. The open-space wet meadows are extremely vulnerable to accidental draining and these same swales are highly productive feeding areas in winter ranges.	1
426	080100-04-01	Routes	Close Routes	Wild and Scenic River	I am opposed to the designation of an off highway vehicle route on Forest Service roads 4N80Y and 4N73Y. Road 4N89Y ends at the NF of the Stanislaus, which is pending status as a Wild and Scenic River by the Forest Service. The noise of OHVs is not something that should exist that close to a potential Wild and Scenic River.	
427	080113-02-01	Routes	Close Routes	Wild and Scenic River	I am opposed to the designation of an off highway vehicle route on Forest Service roads 4N80Y and 4N73Y. Road 4N89Y ends at the NF of the Stanislaus, which is pending status as a Wild and Scenic River by the Forest Service. The noise of OHVs is not something that should exist that close to a potential Wild and Scenic River.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
428	080111-09-01	Routes	Close Routes	Wild and Scenic River	Regarding proposal to allow OHVs on roads 4N80Y and 4N73Y in the NF Stanislaus river canyon: I strongly oppose this proposal in a river corridor which has been designated as a potential wild and scenic. This designation is meant to protect the wilderness qualities of this river canyon, not to allow the noise and dust pollution that will surely come if OHVs are allowed on these roads. Surely you must realize that there would be negative consequences to homeowners in this area, not only from noise and dust, but also in some cases from the probable decline in value of their homes. River canyons are fragile, and without question OHV use in the NF Stanislaus canyon will lead to soil erosion and have negative impacts on water quality.	
429	080102-04-01	Routes	Close Routes	Wildlife	Close or decommission at least 1,000 miles of the 3,415 miles of exiting roads by closing dead-end or unneeded road segments and roads that cut through sensitive wildlife areas.	1
430	080102-05-01	Routes	Close Routes	Wildlife	Close or decommission at least 1,000 miles of the 3,415 miles of exiting roads by closing dead-end or unneeded road segments and roads that cut through sensitive wildlife areas.	1
431	080117-07-03	Routes	Close Routes	Wildlife	In summary, the National Forest Service (NFS) needs to close down or decommission unneeded and dead-end road segments, as well as roads that cut through sensitive wildlife areas, which could eliminate travel in the range of 900 to 1,500 miles. This not only helps with the financial deficit, but also goes a good distance towards the NFS working within existing and foreseeable (and limited) human resources.	1
432	080118-05-01	Routes	Close Routes	Wildlife	Please close at least 1000 miles of dead-end or unneeded segments and roads that cut through sensitive wildlife areas. There are too many unmentioned roads in the forest. There is no money in your budget to do the needed maintenance.	1
433	080109-03-01	Routes	Close Routes	Wildlife	Please make sure all dead-end or not needed roads and road segments that are in sensitive wildlife and plan areas are closed as part of this plan. There are far too many routes currently, a reasonable reduction should remove at least 1/3 of the current inventory	1
434	080122-29-02	Routes	Close Routes		We also submit specific road and route closure recommendations that provide an alternative plan to reduce the road and route system on the Stanislaus NF. SEE LIST	1
435	080122-29-06	Routes	Close Routes		The use of this filter would begin to reduce unnecessary road segments that will drain limited road maintenance budget dollars and cause unnecessary motorized disturbance of wildlife or non-motorized recreational forest visitors. In high timber value areas, designating such dead end spurs for Administrative Use Only would leave open the option for future logging access on the spurs. In the vast amount of area across the forest where that future logging access option is not a need, the closure of unnecessary dead end spurs would benefit watershed values, wildlife and plant species, and non-motorized recreation. The focus of this criteria is to close all such dead-end spurs unless there is a known, identified destination that justifies leaving the route open.	1
436	080122-16-07	Routes	Close Routes		All segments of planned road segments closed to "public" (and FS) wheeled motorized vehicle use must be permanently blocked or barricaded.	1
437	080119-01-09	Routes	Close Routes		Close short spur routes unless needs are identified to remain open for use.	1
438	080122-29-05	Routes	Close Routes		Designate all dead-end spurs of 1/2 mile in length or less as either "Closed To All Motorized Vehicles" or as "Administrative Use Only" unless I.D. Team staff or District staff know of a specific destination benefit that will be accessed by leaving the dead end road segment open to the public.	1
439	080122-29-07	Routes	Close Routes		Designate dead-end road spurs 1/2 to 1 mile long as "Administrative Use Only" in timberland production areas and "Closed to All Motorized Vehicles" in other areas of the Forest unless I.D. Team staff or District staff clearly determine that specific multiple-use benefits of keeping such road segments open exceed the wildlife, watershed, and non-motorized benefits of closing the dead end spur to public motorized access.	1
440	080118-16-02	Routes	Close Routes		Experience shows that motorized users tend to discard trash freely in the NF, and this careless habit can be controlled by minimizing the number of designated roads approved.	1
441	080117-04-01	Routes	Close Routes		I encourage the FS to close as many routes as possible and make them impassable to vehicles of all types, in hope that this will curtail marijuana cultivation and meth labs.	1

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
442	080122-29-08	Routes	Close Routes		Unlike the first criteria, the focus applying this criteria is to close all such dead-end spurs except where either the I.D. Team or District staff clearly judges that the resource benefits of closure will not match or exceed the benefits of keeping the road open. Unless such a clear determination is made by Forest staff, 1/2 to 1 mile-long dead end road spurs should be closed or designated as "Administrative Use Only."	1
443	080117-03-01	Routes	Close Routes		We want the Forest Service to close and rehabilitate the unauthorized OHV trails that pervade the Stanislaus. We are opposed to adding 126 miles of unauthorized trails to the NF System of roads and trails. Few of them can meet Forest Service standards for erosion resistance and drainage, many are on steep slopes, and many cross essential wildlife habitat and riparian areas.	1
444	080116-11-04	Routes	Close Routes		Close or decommission all dead-end road segments less than 1/2 mile in length unless the Forest identifies a specific destination benefit or resource need for a particular road segment. This action would begin to reduce unnecessary road segments that will drain limited road maintenance budget dollars and cause unnecessary motorized disturbance of wildlife or non-motorized recreational forest visitors. In high timber value areas, designating such dead end spurs as "administrative use only" would keep public recreation off but would leave open the option for future logging access on the spurs. But elsewhere on the forest where such a future option is not a concern, closing unnecessary dead end spurs would benefit watershed values, wildlife and plant species, and quiet recreation.	1
445	071226-01-02	Routes	Close Routes		In light of the FS limited funds for maintenance and management, I feel the following steps be implemented: 1. Close or decommission all dead-end road segments that are 1/2 mile or less in length; 2. Close or decommission all low-priority roads that are within the winter deer range areas of PAC's if road density in those polygons is at 2 miles per square mile or greater. Exceptions could be made where the FS has identified a high resource or administrative need; 3. Close or decommission all road segments identified as unclassified or unauthorized in previous or current FS road inventories, unless analysis by NEPA has authorized specific segments to be included in the road system.	1
446	080115-01-04	Routes	Close Routes		It makes no sense for the system you propose to add more than 100 miles of illegally created trails and to keep so many roads open. Many roads and trails are no maintained and are sources of marked erosion. Please close all unneeded roads and restore the area to forest land.	1
447	080108-01-04	Routes	Close Routes		Please close any un-needed or dead-end roads.	1
448	080122-16-03	Routes	Close Routes		Reanalyze current inventoried FS roads and close or decommission a minimum 20 percent of such roads based on these criteria:* Close/decommission all dead-end roads less than half mile long.	1
449	080123-01-03	Routes	Close Routes		The forest already contains too many roads, providing more environmental damage than useful access. The MiWok RD has numerous areas where the road density exceeds the target maximum of two miles per square mile. The Plan should identify 30% of system and non-system roads for closure and decommissioning without significantly reducing access for the public and resource managers.	1
450	080118-21-15	Routes	Close Routes		Eliminate from the proposed system all "contingent" trails, roads, or areas that depend on acquisition of easements not already in place or are in the process of being secured such as the potential access shown for Candy Rock Road in Hathaway Pines in the Calaveras District.	2
451	080118-13-03	Routes	Close Routes		There is much more littering, damage to trees and other flora, and negative human influence in areas that have been opened up to off road vehicles than areas that are still protected. Please don't let this happen to the beautiful canyon surrounding 4N80Y and 4N73Y.	4
452	080111-07-04	Routes	Close Routes		Despite already maintaining over 3,000 miles of road and motorized trail, the STF proposes to add motorized route mileage to the system by opening to motor vehicles 11.6 or closed roads and adding 126.2 miles of new motorized trails. The changes in the proposed action that result in motorized roads and trails being decommissioned or converted to non-motorized use are few: no trails and only 24.5 miles of road.	5
453	080108-11-01	Routes	Close Routes		I am opposed to your proposed action to add 126 miles more roads to STF. I believe that any action to increase or encourage "off-road" vehicles is mis-guided.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
454	080117-06-04	Routes	Close Routes		I would strongly endorse expansion of the Stanislaus model throughout the State, and wish to express my opposition to any designation of expanded roads for OHV use which will only dilute present regulation of these vehicles, and further damage natural resources, despite the best efforts of responsible riders.	5
455	080118-17-02	Routes	Close Routes		It is our understanding that the Travel Management Rule[1] which is the basis for the Forest's proposed action addresses all motor vehicle use on National Forest lands. It seems to us that the proposed action is focused on "grandfathering" user-created OHV routes into the designated route system to such an extent that it overlooks problems that may be associated with some existing, authorized roads and trails.	5
456	080114-09-01	Routes	Close Routes		Preserve what little wild we have in this country and your grandchildren will thank you.	5
457	080118-08-09	Routes	Close Routes		The Proposed Action is not a responsible, enforceable, adequately inventoried, or environmentally sustainable plan.	5
458	080123-01-01	Routes	Close Routes		I reject your contention 2.1 in your purpose and need statement. The USFS is not obligated to provide OHV opportunities when the impacts of such are at odds with others management obligations.	5
459	080102-01-01	Routes	Close Routes		Please reduce the number of OHV trails in our forest, and close all unneeded roads. OHVs especially, create an inordinate amount of noise pollution and also air pollution. With all of the many trails open to OHVs, it is often impossible to escape the obnoxious noise. It isn't fair to us other users!	5
460	080119-01-07	Routes	Close Routes		The proposed addition of nearly 100 miles of unauthorized motorized trail just on the MD, and more in other Districts, is not warranted or justified. These should be closed to use unless and until there is a high level of compliance of all regulations on other approved routes following this process. Only then should there be any consideration be given of approving any portion of these illegal routes.	5
461	080122-29-18	Routes	Close Routes		Our staff identified 438.5 miles of roads in the Proposed Action and available GIS data that were labeled "Unauthorized or Decommissioned Roads" as well as 105.5 miles or trails labeled "Unauthorized or Decommissioned Trails" from the motorized routes GIS data. While these roads and trails may not be officially open for motorized use on the maps, there is often no visible signing or other indication of their closure status in the forest. Put another way, it is a paper exercise to suggest that nearly 500 miles or roads and routes are "unauthorized or decommissioned roads or trails" and to then say that such routes are not "open" because they are not approved for some level of motorized use.	5
462	080107-01-01	Routes	Close Routes		We are in support of designated trails only. The unauthorized trails if not stopped will continue to grow, as we have seen in the past and do great damage to our environment. These roads must be closed.	5
463	080114-04-03	Routes	Close Routes		Close many of the existing roads that are no longer used for resource extraction.	5
464	080122-29-22	Routes	Close Routes		A significantly lower number of unauthorized OHV route miles would be given approval for use compared to the Forest's draft proposed action;	
465	080118-06-02	Routes	Close Routes		Of the proposed 126.2 miles of unauthorized routes to be added to the NFS, the following OHV routes should be eliminated due to their conflicts with watershed, wildlife, soil or sensitive plant resources. SEE LIST	
466	071226-01-03	Routes	Close Routes		I urge the FS not to add the unauthorized routes listed below because of conflicts with watershed, wildlife, soil, or sensitive plant resources 1. In the Calaveras RD, OHV Rt. 17EV275; 2. In the Mi-Wok RD, OHV Rt.s 16EV54; 16EV160; 16EV223; 16EV248; 16EV251;16EV257;16EV258; 16EV265,57; 18EV67; 18EV90; 18EV105, and 18EV308. SEE LIST	
467	071222-01-01	Routes	Close Routes		I am concerned that the following routes are marked as closed on the maps used for route designation. 1S13D in Big Creek Basin may be location of bottom 3rd incline; 2S20C may be the small road that access to the second incline above Camp one; 2S20B; and 2S20H. I do not remember these areas being closed before and from what I have been able to find out from your website, they have been, and they are not included in the route designation process. SEE LIST	
468	080116-06-01	Routes	Close Routes		Me, my family and friends would like to continue to used these routes that are between private property, and the Tim Brush Fuel break area. Some of the vehicles we use are not street legal. These routes allow us legal access. Do not close to OHV access. 2S21 and 2S13y. SEE LIST	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
469	080115-03-01	Routes	Close Routes		I think that opening 4N80Y and 4N73Y to OHVs is inviting problems that will not only contribute to climate change and negatively affect the forest and its current residents -- trees, animals and people -- but will also have an adverse impact on FS resources. Please do NOT open 4N80Y and 4N73Y to OHV use. SEE LIST	
470	080118-21-07	Routes	Close Routes		Close spur and dead-end roads to discourage proliferation of unauthorized routes and to prevent environmental damage.	
471	080111-02-02	Routes	Close Routes		The transportation plan is being enlarged rather than being reduced. Many of the roads should be closed to protect wildlife and watershed values.	
472	080117-11-02	Routes	Close Routes		No user created roads or trails should be legitimized since these are violations of existing USFS policy, and legitimizing them encourages continued violations.	
473	080115-06-02	Routes	Close Routes		The current proposed actions that would designate OHV trails that were illegally created and used sends the wrong message to the recreation public. It is not responsible. It tells those who don't respect the law, that if they break it enough times, their illegal use becomes law.	
474	071212-01-01	Routes	Close Routes		The number of user created and converted roads - 142.5 - that are being considered for inclusion into the travel plan is 1) environmentally unsound, 2) unmanageable by current managers, and 3) unfairly balanced in favor of one forest user over all others. Please remember that these are illegal trails and routes that OHV users have created over the years. Yet, now you seek to reward their flaunting of public forest orders to the continuing detriment of the resource and other forest visitors.	
475	080122-22-04	Routes	Close Routes		Close Date Flat in Greeley Hill area. It is unmaintained and littered. It is adjacent to some private property and in the summer it is a dry area and the OHVs only worsen the condition of the ground-then comes the rain in the winter... a mess!	
476	080116-05-05	Routes	Close Routes		Close all road segments identified as unclassified or unauthorized in previous or current Forest road inventories.	
477	080122-29-11	Routes	Close Routes		CSERC also urges a fourth basic criteria filter: Close (or do not approve use on) roads and routes with identified environmental impacts unless such routes are judged to be truly essential to keep open. To accomplish this fourth suggested criteria, the Forest should list all specific road segments or motorized routes that either Forest employees or individual members of the commenting public have identified as causing some level of environmental effects or which have a high potential for substantial environmental impacts. Determine whether there is any valid information or personal knowledge by I.D. Team staff or District staff that counters the claim that a specific road or route is causing such damage. For any road segment or OHV route where some substantial degree of ecological impact is acknowledged or where the level of environmental harm is undetermined for roads with claimed problems, accept the public input as valid and move to the next step. Screen all such claimed "harmful" road segments or routes with the question as to whether or not the I.D. Team or District staff judges such individual OHV routes or road segments to be highly desirable or essential to keep open	
478	080110-04-01	Routes	Close Routes		I am writing to express opposition to the proposal to designate OHV Routes on FS roads 4N80Y and 4N73Y. Having spent many peaceful days in the vicinity of both these roads, I am very concerned about the noise and dust that will ruin the serene and tranquil environment that surrounds these roads.	
479	080122-14-01	Routes	Close Routes		I realize there must be some type of management in place for these roads and trails. I do believe that the vast majority of these trails should be considered roads. Even though they are dirt Wagner Ridge, Ponderosa, Quailmine, Red Cloud Mine, Old Fiske, etc., are too wide to be classified as a trail and closing them or a portion of them would land lock the residents of Greeley Hill that do enjoy the dirt roads for their outdoor activities.	
480	080118-21-09	Routes	Close Routes		Incorporate only a minimum of illegally created routes, using only those that are environmental sound and can be effectively maintained.	
481	080104-01-05	Routes	Close Routes	Monitoring	Instead of increasing OHV routes, the Forest should decrease OHV routes to the number that can be successfully monitored and managed.	
482	080114-04-02	Routes	Close Routes		Reduce the number of OHV routes above 4,700 elevation.	
483	080118-21-04	Routes	Close Routes		Identify areas where natural resource damage and/or conflict with other forest users has occurred or is occurring and prioritize these areas for closure or rehab.	
484	080117-11-01	Routes	Concession		Another alternative that should be considered is to limit OHV use to several OHV parks that could be run by concessionaires similar to ski areas.	1

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
485	080122-11-01	Routes	Conflicts	Private Property	There are areas up here around Cedar Ridge that are closed. In those areas the OHVs legal and other wise have reversed every bit of taxpayer effort, by those whom we employ to manage our forest. These are trails that are accessed from legal routes and illegal paths. I moved up here to enjoy the hiking trails right here in our back yard. The trails are getting trashed, causing rivelets and gullies every where. And it is getting worse at a progressive rate. There is obviously little to none in the way of enforcing the law. I find it a foolish management idea to think that we can open up more trails, when you can't manage what we have now.	
486	080122-14-05	Routes	Conflicts		I am also concerned about the potential for trespassing and unauthorized trails through both private and environmentally sensitive lands. As a former OHV enthusiast myself I have seen first hand what happens when someone gets bored with the designated trails and spies a more enticing route through the forest. As none of the boundaries between Forest Service Lands, Big Trees State Park and private lands are well marked in this area I think the potential for abuse is huge.	5
487	080115-06-04	Routes	Conflicts		The designation of long through routes or spurs and dead-ends within multiple-use forest land will only exacerbate conflict among users and encourage the proliferation of more illegal routes.	5
488	080114-05-01	Routes	Cross-country Travel	Enforcement	There is no excuse for the current National Forest Proposed Action that would add even more miles of unauthorized off-road vehicle trails to the NF System and would allow cross-country travel up to 100 ft off either side of designated roads and trails; it would make enforcement of authorized routes impossible, and will impact wildlife, hikers and equestrians.	
489	080116-11-11	Routes	Decommission	Minimum System	Any non-essential Forest roads and trails – especially maintenance level 2 roads – should be decommissioned. No new unauthorized motorized routes should be designated in these areas. In semi-primitive Non-motorized Areas, where these two Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) classes do not overlap with agency or citizen-inventoried roadless areas, motorized routes should not be permitted. Forest Plans and agency policy generally prohibit motorized use in these areas.	2
490	080107-02-02	Routes	Decommission		Decommission unnecessary roads and eliminate dead-end and spur roads to discourage proliferation of unauthorized trails. Legitimizing illegally created routes rewards negative behavior; incorporate only roads that are environmentally sound, can be maintained and are consistent with the preceding statement.	1
491	080114-03-03	Routes	Decommission		Decommission unnecessary roads.	5
492	080116-14-03	Routes	Minimum System	Decommission	Keep a minimum of roads necessary to manage the forest, allow for fire protection, and provide access to campgrounds & trailheads. Decommission the rest, including dead-end and spur roads to discourage proliferation of unauthorized trails.	1
493	080118-22-02	Routes	Minimum System	Decommission	the need to—by way of a science-based analysis—“identify the minimum road system needed for safe and efficient travel and for administration, utilization, and protection of National Forest System lands” and identify roads that are “no longer needed to meet forest resource management objectives and that, therefore, should be decommissioned or considered for other uses, such as for trails”;	1
494	080111-07-05	Routes	Minimum System	Decommission	The proposal should concentrate on the following needs, and not designate roads such as FS road 4N80Y: a) the need to eliminate cross-country travel and move to a system of designated roads, trails, and areas consistent with the Travel Management Rule and the Executive Orders on uses of off-road vehicles on public lands; the need to address degradation of environment; the need to identify the minimum road system needed for safe and efficient travel and for administration, utilization, and protection of National Forest System lands, and identify roads that are no longer needed to meet forest resource management objectives and that, therefore, should be decommissioned or considered for other uses; the need to provide opportunities for motorized and non-motorized recreation within the carrying capacity of the land; the need to adjust both the core transportation system and recreation travel network in light of funding limitations for maintenance, monitoring, and enforcement; and, the need to address public safety concerns, user conflicts, private property rights, lost non-motorized recreational opportunities, and impact to natural soundscapes and air quality that have	1
495	080115-01-02	Routes	Minimum System	Parking	Reduce the miles of roads and trails for OHV use to what you can manage effectively and don't allow these vehicles to travel off the roads or trails any farther than it takes to park, except in specific parking areas.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
496	080122-29-01	Routes	Minimum System		CSERC urges the Forest to truly balance multiple use values on the Forest by "minimizing" the road system and motorized OHV routes as required by agency policy. Unfortunately, based upon the public meetings and the present draft proposed action, it appears that instead of aiming to minimize the road system and the motorized OHV route system -- the current proposal would close only 24.5 miles of roads, would open 11.6 miles of closed roads to motorized use, and would add 126.2 of unauthorized trails to the motorized trail system.	1
497	080107-02-01	Routes	Minimum System		Identify and keep a minimum of roads necessary to manage the forest, allow for fire protection and provide access only to designated campgrounds and sites of interest	1
498	080123-01-04	Routes	Minimum System		The goal should be to minimize the road miles to the minimum needed to facilitate access, public safety, and resource protection. This will allow better maintenance of remaining routes, while putting many acres back into productive forest and reducing watershed impacts.	1
499	080118-22-04	Routes	Minimum System		How did you define the minimum transportation system? What methods were used to determine the "minimum" system consistent with requirements established by 36 CFR 212.5 (b) (1) and the draft directives for implementing the Travel Management Rule? What are your decommissioning priorities, and what methodology did you use to arrive at them?	6
500	080118-18-01	Routes	Non-motorized		We are most concerned about motorized trails, rather than use on roads. To perform this analysis, we will need a map of non-motorized trails at the same scale as your proposed motorized routes. Ideally, this will be available in the database for comparison of alternative. Our group and the visitor bureau have requested an official trails map many times during the past ten years. We have been told several times it is close to being complete.	6
501	080123-01-06	Routes	Private Property		OHV use should be at least two miles from neighborhoods and hiking trails.	5
502	080118-02-01	Routes	Private Property		We see no problem with the restriction of OHVs in or near residential areas and no problem with restricting use of any type of vehicle, off the existing road and trail system or into the wilderness.	5
503	071126-02-02	Routes	Right of Way		What is status of right of way procurement in the Jelmini Basin area? ROW re-route is essential to the integrity of this trail system. If ROW not possible, does the FS intend to re-route?	
504	080119-01-01	Routes	Road Density		Proposed route density is excessive in several areas and higher than established "desired" criteria (e.g. 2 miles/square mile); the density must be reduced for responsible resource management	
505	080122-20-08	Routes	Seasonal Closures		Action Item #9 – I oppose proposed action #9: Provide for certain seasonal closures to wheeled motorized travel on NFS roads and trails totaling 837.5 miles. Closed November 1 to May 30. This is unacceptable.	5
506	080116-10-03	Routes	Seasonal Closures		I believe the majority of the actual damage is caused by mostly passenger vehicles on wet, soft roads during the winter season. I see no value in the proposed prohibition of the non street legal vehicles, but would suggest that the efforts which are proposed for area closures (education, signs, enforcement etc.) be redirected to expansion of proposed action item #9 with seasonal closures to all vehicles.	5
507	080122-20-09	Routes	Seasonal Closures		I will support a wet weather closure like Eldorado and Mendocino forests have. One inch of rain in 24 hours then close area to wheeled travel for 48 hours, then reopen!! Very important!	5
508	080118-12-03	Routes	Seasonal Closures		I am opposed to the "blanket" seasonal closure of all of the forest roads within the Stanislaus National Forest and think that any closures should be based on an assessment of environmental impact in areas of concern. There are great opportunities for family outings during the winter months in this national forest that would be forever lost to ours and future generations should this plan be implemented.	5
509	080118-18-04	Routes	Seasonal Closures	Volunteers	We fail to see the benefit of formal dates for winter road closure. Why not let conditions dictate the timing? We would like to see a flexible implementation approach where actions can be adjusted to best accomplish the objectives. We are willing to assist in monitoring and some implementation of actions relating to non-motorized trails.	5
510	080117-12-02	Routes	Shared Use		Is there any part of the development of this proposal that simultaneously evaluates the many recreational uses of the road and trails and areas surrounding them and considers a plan that works best for all groups? If a trail or road is designated for motorized use the value of those routes is greatly diminished for non-motorized uses. Where is this impact evaluated?	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
511	071213-05-01	Routes	Shared Use		Please do not approve of shared use of current OHV motorized trails in the STF as part of the Mokelumne Coast to Crest Trail.	5
512	080122-27-12	Routes	Shared Use		This area is where the Arnold Rim Trail is located. An OHV trail network in the middle of the Arnold Rim Trail is not consistent with that designated plan. Substantial investment of resources by the Forest Service and community groups should not be allowed to be lost by the creation of an OHV trail network in this special area.	5
513	080122-28-12	Routes	Shared Use		This area is where the Arnold Rim Trail is located. An OHV trail network in the middle of the Arnold Rim Trail is not consistent with that designated plan. Substantial investment of resources by the Forest Service and community groups should not be allowed to be lost by the creation of an OHV trail network in this special area.	5
514	080119-01-10	Routes	Speed Limits		Speed limits should be established and reckless driving behavior discouraged.	5
515	080122-28-01	Routes	User Conflicts	Non-motorized	These comments are offered on behalf of the Ebbetts Pass Rivers and Trails Alliance. The EPRTA is the umbrella organization that has been involved in developing the Arnold Rim Trail. The plan as it is currently written would seriously jeopardize the nearly decade-long effort to establish this non-motorized loop trail around Arnold by locating a motorized trail network in the middle of a critical segment of the ART. This segment is on the southern part of the ART project, located east of the Calaveras Big Trees State Park, north of the north fork of the Stanislaus River, west of Doud's Road and South of Love Creek Road. The segment in question involves forest roads 4N35, 5N5Y, and 4N04.	
516	080118-18-02	Routes	User Conflicts	Vehicle Type	We could find no distinction between single-track routes and 4wd dual-track routes on the maps and tables. Different users have their preference, but it seems that there is an abundance of trails that look like roads. Many users; hikers, bikers, and equestrians prefer single track. We are concerned that where motorized and non-motorized uses are combined, there will be more conflict as use increases.	
517	080122-17-01	Routes	User Conflicts		I have been hiking in the Forest for over 15 years, and the impact of off-road use is undeniable, even in wilderness areas where vehicles are illegal. Restricting vehicle use to only legal, posted roads seems like the only way to make the rules clear to off-road drivers.	5
518	080117-06-01	Routes	User Conflicts		We live in Lakemont Pines (Arnold, CA), which adjoins the Stanislaus National Forest (Penny Pines). We hike there frequently and have noticed a great improvement in the forest conditions since OHVs have been banned. The impact of less noise, less dust, less air pollution and less damage to the roads and trails is significant. And, the nearby residents can now enjoy their homes/cabins without the intolerable loud noises created by the OHVs.	5
519	080118-21-05	Routes	Vehicle Type		Provide clear definitions of OHV types and ensure that the plan provides clear management direction appropriate for each type.	2
520	080116-10-01	Routes	Vehicle Type		Proposal to allow "street legal" only vehicles on a large portion of the Miwok district: I do not believe this will do anything to meet the stated goal of preventing "ongoing resource damage from illegal OHV use.... The only wheeled vehicle which cannot be made street legal is the ATV, and it is the vehicle which has the least potential to cause damage. The large balloon type tires of the ATV lend to broad weight distribution and low potential to cause soil compaction as compared again to the "street legal" vehicles.	4
521	080122-20-06	Routes	Vehicle Type		Action Item #7 – I oppose proposed action #7: change 214.2 miles of NFS roads from open to all motorized uses to NFS roads open to highway vehicle use only, (street legal only).	5
522	071219-02-01	Routes	Vehicle Type		We are very happy to see Bondurant Mine Rd. and 2553 have been designated street legal only.	5
523	080118-14-02	Routes	Watershed		The canyon is regrowing after the Darby Fire of 2001. It was back-burned at that time. The OHVs that have been playing across the canyon have not stayed on Candy Rock Road or the other in question, but have raced directly up and down the sides of the hill between the top, the old dump/quarry? and the road. This can't be good for erosion control and ultimately water quality of the Stanislaus River, which, I believe, has been designated Wild and Scenic by you.	5
524	080117-11-05	Special Areas	Wild and Scenic River	Conflicts	The North Fork of the Stanislaus River is a potential wild and scenic river in this area and should be managed as such. Allowing OHVs into the river canyon with the resulting noise and erosion is not consistent with a wild and scenic river canyon.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
525	071221-02-03	Special Areas	Wild and Scenic River		Friends of the River is also concerned that the proposed action would not adequately protect the 200 miles of rivers and streams in the forest that are included or have been recommended for inclusion in the federal Wild & Scenic Rivers System.	5
526	080109-02-02	Special Areas	Wilderness	Non-motorized	Motorized travel should be prohibited on routes that approach the boundaries of Mokelumne, Emigrant or Carson-Iceberg Wilderness, within 1 mile to avoid the temptation that riders will drive on into the wilderness. The closure will also reduce the imposition of OHV engine noise on visitors in the wilderness.	2
527	080109-11-02	Special Areas	Wilderness	Wild and Scenic River	Roads that are in proposed Wilderness areas will cause harm to proposed and existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, montane meadows, and meadow management zones.	2
528	080109-09-02	Special Areas	Wilderness	Wild and Scenic River	Roads should not be permitted in proposed Wilderness areas, roadless areas, and proposed or existing Wild & Scenic River corridors, montane meadows, or meadow management areas.	5
529	080117-03-02	Special Areas	Wilderness	Yosemite	We urge you to close: OHV routes that enter "inventoried roadless areas"; routes that approach the boundaries of wilderness areas or Yosemite NP. These should be terminated at least one mile short of those boundaries so OHV riders will not be tempted to enter the protected area; routes in mountain meadows as OHV traffic increases erosion, leading to a lowered water table and loss of subsurface water that sustains the meadows.	2
530	080115-01-03	Special Areas	Wilderness		I am especially concerned that these noisy vehicles be kept away from wilderness areas, and am pleased to see that there are no OHV trails in the Utica Reservoir area. According to the map supplied, there appear to be trails near other wilderness areas. Please remove such access to protect the environment.	2
531	080109-02-03	Special Areas	Yosemite		Routes that approach the boundaries of Yosemite NP should be prohibited within 1 mile of the park boundary.	5
532	080123-02-01	Special Areas	Yosemite		Yosemite NP primary concerns: illegal camps inside the park and Off-Highway Vehicle incursions into the park, particularly in designated wilderness; access to the park by poachers, particularly near Ackerson Mdw. And Lake Eleanor; access to the park by marijuana gardeners; fire prevention in fire-prone areas of the Tuolumne River Canyon; watershed protection where creeks originate outside the park and flow into the park; protecting natural quiet inside the park; protecting Great Gray Owls, a state-listed endangered species, which often travel back and forth between NPS and the US Forest Service lands. SEE LIST	
533	080119-01-14	Special Uses	Events	Permits	No special event or permit only routes.	5
534	071127-01-02	Special Uses	Events	Watershed	Section 13/14 - upper end of Deer Creek. Proposed that 16EV229 (currently red condition rating) be available for event only use. (Access & location makes it easy to 'slash' closed to general public use. Mitigation for stream crossing may be needed.	
535	071127-01-01	Special Uses	Events		16EV253 (Grant Ridge) important trail for event loops. Consider it for even only us. Or, with some mitigation it could be left open for general public use.	
536	071127-01-04	Special Uses	Events		16EV133 (section 2) - in the vicinity of this managed trail (16EV133), there is an existing route not on the map (runs parallel to 16EV133, located to the north of this trail). It is needed to complete a loop during event/permit use.	
537	071127-01-05	Special Uses	Events		17EV121 & 17EV122b (section 29) - Little Burma trail. This is a critical event trail needed to get across SPI ground.	
538	080119-01-11	Special Uses	Permits		An annual permit system, perhaps like for campfire permits, should be required for all OHV users on Forest lands. That way such users could be insured of having received some level of instruction and information of proper conduct on an annual basis.	1
539	071206-01-03	Special Uses	Permits		Travel use permits should be required and the number of those permits should be limited to the carrying capacity of the area.	1
540	080116-09-03	Special Uses	Permittee	Add Routes	Per the wording of the commercial use permit, all roads and trails within the boundary of the Bear Valley ski area should remain open to OHV use in the summer. Historically the permit holder has violated the terms of the use permit by closing all the roads and trails within the permit area. This should be clarified through this process.	1

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
541	071228-01-01	Special Uses	Permittee	Liability	17EV280 and 16EV287 maintenance roads for Bear Valley Mt. Resort: "These two roads have been closed and excluded from travel management. Plan for over two decades. As a Special Use Permit holder, need to go on record stating that for obvious safety reasons the agency should not be authorizing motorized uses within the ski area SUP at any time of year." Opening these two roads "to public motorized uses appears to be arbitrary and capricious. It imposes the unmanageable risks and liability to the permittee. It risks substantial environmental and resource damage".	5
542	080110-07-01	Special Uses	Permittee	User Conflicts	We oppose for OHV traffic on the access road from Flint Rd to BVMR parking lot and the maintenance road connecting the BVMR maintenance center to Bear top- reason being safety concerns, especially on the maintenance road and planned use for walking trails and mountain biking when the village lift is operational.	5
543	080109-02-05	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Big Game Retrieval	Cross country motorized travel for game retrieval should be prohibited.	5
544	080108-07-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Big Game Retrieval	Prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping.	5
545	080109-09-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Big Game Retrieval	I urge you to prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game removal and dispersed camping. Creating 200 ft. wide cross country vehicle travel corridors along NFS roads would make enforcement of authorized routes difficult if not impossible and would lead to wide swaths of damage.	
546	080118-03-01	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Camping	STF has provided a better solution then most National Forest in California with Proposed Action #8. I do have a concern with campsite areas that have been well established and are beyond the 100 foot corridor. I would like the EIS to address established campsites that been used for decades that may be up to 100 yards from the main road or trail.	5
547	080122-01-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Camping	The Proposed Action allows a reasonable area in which we have access to campsites and parking. I do have a concern with campsite areas that have been well established and are beyond the 100 ft corridor. I would like the EIS to address established campsites that have been used for decades that may be up to 100yards from the main road or trail.	5
548	080118-18-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Camping	Many trail users and recreationists stage from informal campsites and trailheads that are not on the inventory map at this time. Most occur more than 100' from the main road. We would like to have these roads included in the inventory and identified as designated routes, or have the 100' distance increased to at least 300'. A distinction should be made between traveling on a long established road and taking the vehicle off the road for camping or parking. Tom Quinn said "none of these spurs will be closed without a good reason" at the Sonora meeting and we encourage this to be the case.	
549	080116-11-12	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Camping	Perhaps the most alarming detail in the NOI is the proposal to allow cross-country motorized travel for 100 feet on both sides of a road or motorized trail for camping, parking, woodcutting, and gathering forest products. Broad cross-country exceptions are contrary to the intent of the route designation process, and, if instituted would negate the intent and effect of this proposal. Staff told me at a public meeting that it was not meant to "open" a wide cross-country 100-ft corridor, but to continue the ability to drive off a designated route where such use had been traditional. Yet, the proposed action does not limit people to places where existing campsites already are; it specifically opens a 200-foot wide cross-country corridor; this language must be changed. If spur routes exist to camping sites, then let them be designated as such.	
550	080108-10-01	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Compliance	Creating 200 foot-wide cross-country vehicle travel corridors along NFS roads would make enforcement of authorized routes impossible and would lead to unimaginable damage.	5
551	080117-09-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Compliance	Creating 200 ft cross-country vehicle travel corridors along NFS roads would make enforcement of authorized routes difficult if no impossible and would lead to wide swaths of damage, because motorized us would be authorized off the road and or trail at any point along the route system.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
552	080125-01-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Compliance	Creating 200 ft cross-country vehicle travel corridors along NFS roads would make enforcement of authorized routes difficult if no impossible and would lead to wide swaths of damage, because motorized use would be authorized off the road and or trail at any point along the route system.	5
553	080114-07-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Compliance	Creating 200 ft cross-country vehicle travel corridors along NFS roads would make enforcement of authorized routes difficult if not impossible and would lead to wide swaths of damage, because motorized us would be authorized off the road and or trail at any point along the route system.	5
554	080114-08-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Compliance	Creating 200 ft cross-country vehicle travel corridors along NFS roads would make enforcement of authorized routes difficult if not impossible and would lead to wide swaths of damage, because motorized us would be authorized off the road and or trail at any point along the route system.	5
555	080115-02-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Compliance	Creating 200 ft cross-country vehicle travel corridors along NFS roads would make enforcement of authorized routes difficult if not impossible and would lead to wide swaths of damage, because motorized us would be authorized off the road and or trail at any point along the route system.	5
556	080108-14F-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Compliance	Creating 200 ft cross-country vehicle travel corridors along NFS roads would make enforcement of authorized routes difficult if not impossible and would lead to wide swaths of damage, because motorized us would be authorized off the road and or trail at any point along the route system.	5
557	080108-05-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Compliance	Creating 200 ft cross-country vehicle travel corridors along NFS roads would make enforcement of authorized routes difficult if not impossible and would lead to wide swaths of damage.	5
558	080108-06-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Compliance	Creating 200 ft cross-country vehicle travel corridors along NFS roads would make enforcement of authorized routes difficult if not impossible and would lead to wide swaths of damage.	5
559	080108-13-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Compliance	Creating 200 ft cross-country vehicle travel corridors along NFS roads would make enforcement of authorized routes difficult if not impossible and would lead to wide swaths of damage, because motorized use would be authorized off the road and or trail at any point along the route system.	
560	080122-29-20	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	A standard base policy could be enacted to "limit off-road vehicle travel to no more than one or two vehicle lengths off existing roads. But the Forest could include in its policy a provision that each district could add to that one-two vehicle length provision the ability for campers, hunters, woodcutters, book-readers, wildlife viewers, etc. To drive much further than one or two vehicle lengths – but only at clearly marked "side route" pull-offs that are signed and posted.	5
561	080107-02-05	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Allow vehicles off roads and trails only the distance needed to park safely, except where signs indicate parking for camping areas or sites of interest. The 100/200 foot policy is too excessive.	5
562	080116-14-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Allow vehicles off roads and trails the distance needed to park safely, except where signs indicate parking for campsites, trailheads, or sites of interest. 100' may not be prudent.	5
563	080108-05-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	I request that you prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping, but allow forest visitors to park their motor vehicle within one vehicle length from the edge of the road or trail surface when it is safe to do so and does not result in damage to the forest.	5
564	080108-13-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	I request that you prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping, but allow forest visitors to park their motor vehicle within one vehicle length from the edge of the road or trail surface when it is safe to do so and does not result in damage to the forest.	5
565	080116-11-13	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	In general, however, good camping is available if a vehicle parks only one vehicle length from the designated route. One vehicle length off-road driving permission seems to be common in other California forest travel management plans, and there is no good reason for the Stanislaus to deviate from this norm. Indeed, doing so can only add confusion, as people may not always be certain just where a forest boundary is.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
566	080116-04-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	It makes sense fiscally, socially and environmentally that vehicles be allowed off roads and trails only the distance needed to park safely. It makes sense to keep the number of roads necessary to manage the Forest, allow for fire protection, and provide access to campgrounds to a minimum, and to decommission unnecessary roads and eliminate dead-end and spur roads to discourage proliferation of unauthorized trails.	5
567	080122-16-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Length of travel off authorized existing roads: 50 feet or 3 vehicle lengths, whichever is less.	5
568	080114-03-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Limit vehicle travel off roads or trails to that required to safely park.	5
569	080110-02-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	No trucks or jeeps should travel off the roadways that are designed to concentrate the impacts. Creating a use easement of 100 ft. either side of the roadway defies engineering sense. A 50 ft. easement normally carries pavement, power lines & phone lines with ample berm for pull-off flanking both sides. One car length from the roadway suffices.	5
570	080108-02-01	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Please limit public wheeled motorized travel off of designated NFS roads and trails to a distance of no greater than 2 vehicle lengths.	5
571	080110-06-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping, but allow forest visitors to park their motor vehicles within one vehicle length from the edge of the road or trail surface when it does not damage forest resources.	5
572	080108-06-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping, but allow forest visitors to park their motor vehicles within one vehicle length from the edge of the road or trail surface when it does not damage forest resources.	5
573	080109-07-04	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping, but allow forest visitors to park their motor vehicles within one vehicle length from the edge of the road or trail surface when it does not damage forest resources.	5
574	080109-06-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping, but allow forest visitors to park their motor vehicles within one vehicle length from the edge of the road or trail surface when it does not damage forest resources.	5
575	080117-09-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping, but allow forest visitors to park their motor vehicles within one vehicle length from the edge of the road or trail surface when it does not damage forest resources.	5
576	080114-07-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping, but allow forest visitors to park their motor vehicles within one vehicle length from the edge of the road or trail surface when it does not damage forest resources.	5
577	080114-08-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping, but allow forest visitors to park their motor vehicles within one vehicle length from the edge of the road or trail surface when it does not damage forest resources.	5
578	080115-02-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping, but allow forest visitors to park their motor vehicles within one vehicle length from the edge of the road or trail surface when it does not damage forest resources.	5
579	080125-01-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping, but allow forest visitors to park their motor vehicles within one vehicle length from the edge of the road or trail surface when it does not damage forest resources.	5
580	080108-14F-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping, but allow forest visitors to park their motor vehicles within one vehicle length from the edge of the road or trail surface when it does not damage forest resources.	5

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
581	071226-01-01	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	The Forest Service needs to limit motorized vehicles traveling off designated NFS roads and trails to a distance of no less than two vehicle lengths. The only exception to this limitation would be when the FS clearly evaluates a dispersed campsite to be appropriate for access. The FS staff would sign or identify a specific direct route to provide access.	5
582	080122-29-24	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Vehicle travel off roads would be restricted to two vehicle lengths, except that side spur pull-offs would be allowed wherever Districts marked and signed appropriate longer off-road dispersed camping, wood-gathering, etc.	5
583	080109-02-06	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	We oppose the concept of 200 foot corridors for camping along NFS roads. One vehicle length is a good compromise, allowing camping next to the road.	5
584	080116-05-04	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Wheeled motorized vehicles should not be allowed off designated routes further than is required to park.	5
585	080122-10-09	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Wheeled motorized vehicles should not be allowed off designated routes further than is required to park. All dead end roads less than a half mile in length should be closed. Close all low priority roads within winter deer range areas or PAC's. Close all road segments identified as unclassified or unauthorized in previous or current Forest road inventories, except where NEPA analysis has authorized they be included in the road system. Seasonally close all roads and routes in winter deer ranges, especially Deer Creek and Jawbone, from November 15th through April 30th.	5
586	080109-11-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	You need to prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping, but allow visitors to park cars within one vehicle length from edge of road or as motorized use would be authorized off the road and/or trail at any point along the route system.	5
587	080116-03-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Your proposal to allow vehicles to travel 100 ft off roads is excessive, 30 or 40 ft allows plenty of room to park off the road.	5
588	080118-21-14	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Allow vehicles off roads and trails only the distance needed to park safely, except where maps or signs specifically allow parking for campsites or particular sites of interest. Allowing all vehicles to travel 100 ft off of all trails and roads could have a devastating effect on the forest environment, could increase the unsportsmanlike use of vehicles for hunting, give undue privilege to persons who recreate with motorized vehicles, and is decidedly inconsistent with the direction of the final TMFR, which states: The TMFR provides that "in designating routes, the responsible official may include in the designating the limited use of motor vehicles within a specified distance of certain designated routes, and if appropriate, within specified time periods, solely for the purposes of big game retrieval or dispersed camping." Further, "the Department expects the Forest Service to apply this provision sparingly, on a local or State-wide basis, to avoid undermining the purposes of the final rule and to promote consistency in implementation." As well, nothing in this final rule requires inclusion of either activity in a designation, or reconsideration of any decision prohibiting motor vehicle use w	
589	080104-01-01	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Currently the FS is considering to allow motorized vehicles to drive 100 feet from existing roads. This would be a travesty. Instead of a one or two lane road, there would be a multiple lane road. The road's width could be expanded by 200 feet. The allowance should be reduced to one or two car lengths. This is plenty of space for parking vehicles. Forest users can WALK to obtain firewood, set up camp, etc.	
590	080118-05-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Do not allow trucks and jeeps to travel up to 100 feet off both sides of the roads. This idea will encourage riders to believe they have a 200- foot wide corridor to ride. They will not care about damage to the forest. The limit should be no more than two car lengths from the road.	
591	080117-07-04	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Due to the heavy impact of vehicles and OHVs on natural resources, please limit travel to only developed roads, trails and parking areas, and limit parking (or travel) to no more than two vehicle (auto) lengths off the sides of roads. This will keep the more expensive maintenance and restoration costs down, while remaining enforcement expense neutral since enforcement is required in any case.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
592	080122-19-01	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	First, I would like suggest that at least 1,000 of the current 3,415 miles be closed to protect watershed and sensitive wildlife areas. Also, the current proposal allows vehicle travel up to 100 feet off both sides of the roadway. This seems excessive, and I would urge the Forest Service to limit travel to no more that two vehicle lengths to prevent resource damage and erosion. Lastly, I would like to see all roads in the critical winter deer range areas closed during the winter months.	
593	080122-21-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	I am strongly against allowing parking up to 100 feet off-road or off-trail. This policy would permit thousands of "user-created" spurs to camp sites, fishing holes, etc., and spurs heading off 100 feet in either direction create a 200-foot wide corridor of potential abuse. One or two-car lengths is far more reasonable. Please keep motors on or near roads.	
594	080102-05-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	I believe that your current proposal to allow trucks and travel as much as 100 ft. off the sides of roads is damaging to the natural environment, unnecessary, and unreasonable. I urge you to limit any such travel to no more than two vehicle lengths.	
595	080122-13-01	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	I request that you prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval and dispersed camping, but allow Forest visitors to park their motor vehicle within one vehicle length from the edge of the road or trail surface when it is safe to do so and does not result in damage to Forest resources. Creating 200 foot-wide cross-country vehicle travel corridors along National Forest roads would make enforcement of authorized routes difficult if not impossible and would lead to wide swaths of damage, as motorized use would be authorized off the road and/or trail at any point along the route system.	
596	080109-03-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	In order to prevent further resource damage, please limit travel off of roads to two vehicle lengths enough to turn around instead of the proposed 100 feet.	
597	080117-03-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Please reject the idea of 200 foot wide corridors for camping along NFS roads. It is natural for campers to seek a nice quiet place, but when everybody drives off the road to make a new campsite, we end up with hundreds of spur roads. A reasonable compromise is to allow camping within one vehicle length of the road.	
598	080123-01-08	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	The plan to allow motorized access on 100 ft of each side of the 3400 miles of Forest roads would open the door to untold acres of damaged land, and an ugly experience for all forest travelers. The maximum of two car lengths is adequate to access firewood or to park for camping or recreating, and is much less unsightly.	
599	080111-02-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	The proposal to allow travel up to 100 feet off roads is an invitation for more damage to the forest resource. I can remember when such travel was allowed only to be withdrawn because of resource damage. It is almost certain damage will occur again. I urge you to limit such travel to specific locations or much shorter distances to protect the forest resources.	
600	080118-22-07	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	The Stanislaus NF should prohibit cross-country motorized travel for big game retrieval, dispersed camping, and other activities but allow Forest visitors to park their motor vehicle within one vehicle length from the edge of the road or trail surface when it is safe to do so, does not result in damage to Forest resources, and is not disallowed in Forest-specific orders or plans (see Appendix D). If certain dispersed camp sites are far from system roads, the Stanislaus NF should consider designating routes to these dispersed campsites instead of permitting cross-country travel. If cross-country exceptions are incorporated into the EIS, then extensive environmental analysis under NEPA would need to be completed on all lands affected by the exception. This analysis would include a complete ecological, cultural, archaeological, and historical site survey of the cross-country exception zone surrounding each motorized route.	
601	080102-04-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Urge the Forest to limit any such travel off the sides of roads to no greater than two vehicle lengths to prevent resource damage.	
602	080119-01-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Parking	Vehicles should be allowed no more than 1-2 vehicle lengths from roads (not 100 feet which is just inviting extensive resource impacts and is far beyond national or regional direction). Many motorized users simply do not or will not recognize the resource damage they cause.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
603	080118-22-01	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel	Resources	We have identified the following needs : the need to eliminate cross-country travel and move to a system of designated roads, trails, and areas consistent with the Travel Management Rule and the Executive Orders on use of off-road vehicles on public lands; the need to address degradation of environmental, social, and cultural resources associated both with user-created routes and currently designated roads, trails, and areas, as identified through Travel Analysis.	5
604	080118-21-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel		CORE is deeply concerned about the language suggesting that open cross-country use is not prohibited in the Stanislaus. It should be noted that since a least 1991, the Stanislaus has had a policy prohibiting open, cross-country OHV use and requires that OHV recreation take place on designated trails only (1991 Land and Resource Management Plan). The scoping notice dated November 13, 2007 states that "currently wheeled motorized vehicle travel by the public is not prohibited off designated routes." This is misleading, and requires correction to ensure that the analysis of a proposed OHV recreation system is conducted with an appropriate baseline, which is one where OHV use off designated routes has been prohibited for nearly two decades.	2
605	080122-20-07	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel		Action Item #8 – I support the proposed action #8: Prohibit public motorized travel off of designated NFS roads and trails except where: (a) traveling up to 100 feet (change to 200) off of designated NFS roads and NFS trails for direct access to campsites, parking, woodcutting, or gathering forest products provided that no resource damage occurs and such access is not otherwise prohibited: or, (b) allowed by permit or other authorization.	5
606	080102-06-01	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel		Allowing scattered and widespread use of off-road vehicles and allowing motor vehicles to travel 100 ft. off of roads would invite untold damage to our beautiful public lands	5
607	071126-03-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel		No to opening up "more "unauthorized" routes to Motorized User Groups. They don't need that extra 100 ft. of existing roads and trails for camping, parking, and for getting firewood.	5
608	080122-06-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel		The off-road parking requirement of no more than 100 ft is unreasonable and perhaps unsafe.	5
609	080118-08-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel		Up to 100 feet from roads and trails is excessive for unlicensed OHVs. The "no resource damage" will become resource damage.	5
610	080114-04-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel		I am also concerned about allowing vehicles to go 100 ft off roads and trails with virtually no limitations. This could lead to massive damage with little or no recourse for the Forest Service.	
611	080114-04-01	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel		Limit the travel zone of OHV to a narrow strip along travel routes- no more than 25 feet as this more than adequate for OHV activity. To allow them to travel 100 ft. will produce unacceptable, long-term damage to the forest.	
612	080118-07-03	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel		On the roads proposed to be open for public use, it appears that travel up to 100 feet from the road for direct access to campsites, parking, woodcutting, etc. will be allowed, whereas in some of the route designation plans for other National Forests, this travel is restricted to a substantially lesser distance. Allowing 100 ft could potentially result in the risk of significant resource damage.	
613	080104-02-02	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel		Please restrict all vehicles to the roads only. There is no need for vehicles to go off road for any distance. This only trashed the forest and encourages more off road use.	
614	080111-07-01	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel		We were alarmed to see 270 miles of unauthorized routes in the Stanislaus NF OHV route inventory. This figure clearly illustrates the need to end unrestricted cross-country travel. Consequently, we strongly support the goals of the agency to prohibit widespread cross-country travel and to designate roads, trails, and areas for OHV use.	

Public Comment Summary

#	Comment Number	Issue Group	Sub-Issue 1	Sub-Issue 2	Statement/Concern	NSI (1-6)
615	080115-01-01	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel		With more than 1600 miles of roads and trails to travel and permission to ride vehicles 100 ft off roads and trails, the likelihood of continued damage is about 100%. These vehicles damage the environment, disturb wildlife, and create disruption for those of us who enjoy quiet recreation.	
616	080117-02-01	Travel Corridors	Cross-country Travel		Your plan to allow 1400 miles of roads and 200 miles of trails for off-highway vehicle use puts our forest at great risk of abuse. To allow the vehicles to travel 100 ft off either side of the roads or trails is inviting widening of roads and the creation of more and more illegal trails that will further damage the environment.	

Legend

NSI Non-Significant Issue

Reasons for issues being considered non-significant include:

1. The issue is outside of the scope of the proposed action.
2. The issue is already determined through law, regulation, Forest Plan or other higher level decision.
3. The issue is irrelevant to the decision to be made.
4. The issue is conjectural and not supported by scientific fact.
5. The issue is a comment, opinion or position statement.
6. The issue is a question for clarification or information

CFR Code of Federal Regulations

EA Environmental Assessment

EIS Environmental Impact Statement

FS Forest Service

MOI Memorandum of Intent

NEPA National Environmental Policy Act

NFS National Forest System

NOI Notice of Intent

OHV Off Highway Vehicle

PAC Protected Activity Center

STF Stanislaus National Forest

TES Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive

USFS United States Forest Service

Public Comment Summary

Respondent Number	Name	Organization	Submission
071123-01	Robert R. Rogers	Private Party	letter
071126-01	Walter Middleton	Private Party	letter
071126-02	Jeff Sibley	Private Party	letter
071126-03	Laura I. Vernon	Private Party	letter
071127-01	Michael Damaso	Merced Dirt Riders	oral comment
071128-01	Michael Jow	Private Party	comment form
071129-01	Suzette Laffranchi	Homeowners	comment form
071205-01	Kent Sundgren	Private Party	email
071205-02	Will Mulock	USFS Trails Volunteer	letter
071206-01	Jack Robbins	Private Party	letter
071206-02	H.L. Hughes	Private Party	email
071206-03	Dyarle Sharkey	Private Party	email
071206-04	Gloria Heggy	Private Party	email
071210-01	George Webb	Private Party	letter
071212-01	Don and Barbara Rivenes	Private Party	letter
071212-02	Steve Bartolomei	Espirit de Four, 4WD Club	email
071212-03	Ron Frey	Espirit de Four, 4WD Club	email
071212-04	Carlos Fuchen	Espirit de Four, 4WD Club	email
071213-01	Tom Vella	Espirit de Four, 4WD Club	email
071213-02	Darell Kroeker	CA 4WD Club	email
071213-03	Charles Rippen	Espirit de Four, 4WD Club	email
071213-04	Brian Geranen	Espirit de Four, 4WD Club	email
071213-05	Richard Beard	Espirit de Four, 4WD Club	email
071218-01	Ole Stortroen	Private Party	letter
071219-01	J.A. Farrow	California Highway Patrol	letter
071219-02	Jeannette and Bill O'Neil	Homeowners	comment form
071219-03	John B. Armstrong	Private Party	letter
071219-04	Sandra and Grant Taylor	Private Party	comment form
071219-05	John P. Ruiz	CA 4WD Club	letter
071219-06	Janet Bibby	Mariposa Co. Board of Sup.	letter
071221-01	Tony Gheno	Private Party	post card
071221-02	Soren Jespersen	Friends Of The River	letter
071221-03	Blaine Rogers	Sierra Club, Tuolumne Group	letter
071222-01	Steve Egbert	Private Party	letter
071226-01	John Turner	Private Party	letter
071228-01	Jim Gentling	Bear Valley Mt. Resort	letter
080102-01	Jerome L. Fueslein	Private Party	letter
080102-02	Pat Koehn	Private Party	letter
080102-04	Tom H. Piatt	Private Party	letter
080102-05	Robin L. Schaeffer, Ph.D.	Private Party	letter
080102-06	Mathilde Schmidt	Homeowner	letter
080102-07	Doug Balmain	Retired Mariposa Co Supervisor	letter
080104-01	Elaine Gorman	Homeowner - Twain Harte, CA	letter
080104-02	Phil Schermeister	Recreationist	letter
080104-03	Robert Hohn	Teacher & Ecology Club Advisor	letter
080104-04	Ed Struffenegger	District Manager, SPI Martell	letter
080107-01	Charlotte and Raymond Gruendl	Private Party	email
080107-02	Lucian R. Blazej	Private Party	email
080108-01	Gay Varn Buhler	Private Party	letter
080108-02	Pat Cluff	Private Party	post card
080108-03	Nanci Robinson	Private Party	post card
080108-04	Rick & Nanci Robinson	Private Property Owner	post card
080108-05	Thomas Danfield	Private Party	email
080108-06	Lawrence Thompson	Private Party	email
080108-07	Carolyn Barkow	Private Party	email
080108-08	Cathy Lewis-Dougherty	Private Party	email
080108-09	Dorothy Nicholson	Private Party	email
080108-10	Kenneth King	Private Party	email
080108-11	Peggy Rodriguez	Private Party	email
080108-12	Dr. Glenda Hope	Private Party	email

Public Comment Summary

Respondent Number	Name	Organization	Submission
080108-13	Phil Burton	Private Party	email
080108-14/F	Michael Tomczyszyn	Wilderness Society Form Letter	email
080109-01	Dan Parks	Recreation visit	comment form
080109-02	George & Frances Alderson	Forest Visitor	letter
080109-03	Mark Stevens	Hiker/backpaker	letter
080109-04	Sharon Hasler, Sister Gelmi	Homeowner	email
080109-05	Mary Matzek	Private Party	email
080109-06	Thomas Beck	Private Party	email
080109-07	Diane Carney	Biologist	email
080109-08	Deborah Blakeney	Private Party	email
080109-09	Peter Steinhart	Private Party	email
080109-10	Corinne Van Houten	Private Party	email
080109-11	Pat Doherty	FS Volunteer/Angeles NF	email
080110-01	Joanne Rovno	Private Party	letter
080110-02	Bud Hockstra	"Berry Blest Farm"/resident	letter
080110-03	Bob Airola	Rancher	letter
080110-04	Alexander Serriere	Recreationist	email
080110-05	John and Diane Geer	Mud Sweat and Gears 4WD Club	email
080110-06	Henry Tang	Private Party	email
080110-07	Martin Wegenstein	CEO Bear Valley Resort Group	email
080111-01	Larry Hunt	Private Party	post card
080111-02	Delmar W. Dow	Cabin owner/resident	letter
080111-03	John Hampton	Outdoor enthusiast	email
080111-04	Megan Kelso	Private Party	email
080111-05	Marcy Wheeler	Homeowner	email
080111-06	Alida Payson	Private Party	email
080111-07	Barbara and Donald Rivenes	Forest Issues Group	email
080111-08	Marena Tynan La Fontaine	Private Party	email
080111-09	Michael Holstrom	Private Party	email
080111-10	Anne Rosenthal	Private Party	email
080113-01	Rahn Becker	Outdoor enthusiast/Resident	email
080113-02	Liyam Eloul	Outdoor enthusiast	email
080114-01	Bob Spencer	Resident	letter
080114-02	Annette Faurote	Resident	letter
080114-03	George M. Crandell, Jr.	Private Party	letter
080114-04	George W. Bergantz	Private Party	letter
080114-05	Donna R. Jones	Forest User	email
080114-06	Jane Warren	Private Party	email
080114-07	Merle Neidell	Private Party	email
080114-08	Cristopher Lihou	Private Party	email
080114-09	Gerald Rilling	Private Party	email
080114-10	Pamela Hoye	Off-road enthusiast	email
080115-01	William Poulson	Resident/Business Owner	letter
080115-02	Joanne Capozzelli	Private Party	email/letter
080115-03	Rohn Eloul	Private Party	email
080115-04	Jeff Alexander	Mud Sweat and Gears 4WD Club	email
080115-05	Steve and Sue Salnick	Private Party	email
080115-06	Will Mullock/Al Chernoff	Private Party	notes/oral comments
080116-01	Randy Crutcher	Private Party	email
080116-02	Aaron Davis	American Motorcycle Assoc.	email
080116-03	Richard Stark	Forest Recreationist	letter
080116-04	Erin Ross	Calaveras Resident	letter
080116-05	Jeffry M. Voorhees	Private Party	letter
080116-06	Andy Jensen	Private Party	comment form
080116-07	Neil and Annette Stout	Private Party	comment form
080116-08	Lyle Turpin	Mariposa Co. Board of Sup.	Comment Form/letter
080116-09	Jeff Sanford	Private Party	email
080116-10	Ron Medearis	Recreationist	letter
080116-11	Vicky Hoover	Sierra Club, Tuolumne Group	email
080116-12	Carly and Bob Wood	Private Party	email

Public Comment Summary

Respondent Number	Name	Organization	Submission
080116-13	Don Amador	BlueRibbon Coalition	email/letter
080116-14	Sunny Sorensen	Private Party	email
080117-01	Gary A. Scarborough and Sandra Cedergren	Private Property Owner	fax
080117-02	Bobbette Budworth	Private Property Owner	letter
080117-03	Jim and Liz Robinson	Recreationist	letter
080117-04	Joe Meyer	Recreationist	email
080117-05	Arthur C. Steinman	Private Party	email
080117-06	Pat Gende	Private Party	email
080117-07	Craig and Elaine Maxwell	Rancher	email
080117-08	Gerald Mercer	Mercer's Guitars/Mercer's Acoustic	email/no attachment
080117-09	James Adams	Private Party	email
080117-10	Toni Houck	Private Party	email
080117-11	Bob Kelso	Private Party	email
080117-12	Doug Frazer	Private Party	email/part unreadable
080117-13	Amanda Rowe	Private Party	email/no attachment
080117-14	Marilyn Markanen	Private Party	email
080118-01	Michael Damaso	Merced Dirt Riders	fax
080118-02	Michael Welsh	Local resident/forest visitor	Comment Form/letter
080118-03	David M. Murphy	4x4 In Motion 4WD Club	letter
080118-04	Bruce Whitcher	Stewards of the Sequoia	letter
080118-05	Jon M Sturtevant	Chair, Tuolumne Group Sierra Club	letter
080118-06	Tom Harrington	Central Sierra Audubon Society	letter
080118-07	Tim M. Tate	Manager, SPI Sonora District	letter
080118-08	Frank Rauchschalbe	Private Party	letter
080118-09	Mel Bradley	Recreationist	email
080118-10	Douglas Markkanen	Private Party	email
080118-11	Charline Dunasky	Private Party	email
080118-12	Robert L. Clark	Private Party	email
080118-13	Stephanie Patterson	Forest Visitor	email
080118-14	Susan Shoaff	Private Party	email
080118-15	Jared Pechan, P.E.	Private Party	email
080118-16	Don Hildenbrand	Forest Visitor	email
080118-17	Sam Davidson	CA Field Director Trout Unlimited	email
080118-18	Rich Moody	Chair, Tuolumne Co Trails Council	email
080118-19	Michael Damaso	Am.Motorcyclist Assn.,Bl.Ribbon	letter
080118-20	Dennis Scroggins	Merced Dirt Riders	oral comment
080118-21	Judith Spencer	CORE	email
080118-22	Stan Van Velsor	Wilderness Society	
080119-01	Tim Ford	Private Party	email
080119-02	Evan Kieser	Eagle Scout/voter	email
080120-01	Michael Damaso	Merced Dirt Riders/93 names petition	fax
080122-01/ 1	Eric L. Price	CA Registered Geologist	letter
080122-01/ 2	Eric L. Price	CA Registered Geologist	letter
080122-01/ 3	Eric L. Price	CA Registered Geologist	letter
080122-01/ 4	Eric L. Price	CA Registered Geologist	letter
080122-02	Tina Craig	Property Owner	email
080122-03	Robert and Dorothy Mintz	Property Owner	email
080122-04/ 1	Paul Peterson	Nordic Center Owner/Homeowner	email
080122-04/ 2	Paul Peterson	Summer permittee/BV resident	email
080122-05	Arlene S. Mueller	Homeowner	letter
080122-06	Nanci Sikes	Tuolumne Co Visitors Bureau	letter
080122-07	Laura Fujii	Environmental Protection Agency	letter
080122-08	Pete and Chris Eakle	Trails rider	letter
080122-09	Bob Hackamack	Private Party	letter
080122-10	Marny Voorhees	Mountain Alliance	letter
080122-11	Steve Matthews	Cedar Ridge homeowner	email
080122-12	Christine Carson	Hiker/backpaker	email
080122-13	Christopher Lish	Private Party	email
080122-14	Bill Bailey	Recreationist	email
080122-15	Troy Kardas	Love Creek Property Owner	email

Public Comment Summary

Respondent Number	Name	Organization	Submission
080122-16	Frank Oyung	Sierra Club, Tuolumne Group	email
080122-17	Dave Holton	Hiker/backpaker	email
080122-18	no name	Unhappy hunter	email
080122-19	Dan Unger	Hiker/backpaker	email
080122-20	Rick Araujo	Recreationist	email
080122-21	Brad Barker	Hiker/backpaker	email
080122-22	Teri Graf-Pulvino	Private Party	email
080122-23	Michel Frank	Private Party	email
080122-24	Jeanne Beauchel	Private Party	email
080122-25	Paul and Cheryl Sartorio	Cabin owner/resident	email
080122-26	Eric Protiva	Rancher- Buckhorn Flat Ranch	email
080122-27	David Alford	Love Creek Ranch Manager	email
080122-28	Warren Alford	Ebbetts Pass Rivers and Trails Allia.	email
080122-29	Brenda Whited	CSERC	email
080122-30/ A	Michael Damaso	BRC, AMA,D-36,CAL4WD,CORVA	email
080122-30/ B	Michael Damaso		email
080123-01	Clay Knopf	Private Party	letter
080123-02	Michael J. Tollefson	Yosemite NP Superintendent	letter/fax
080125-01	Fred Ginnebaugh	Private Party	email
080125-02	Cathi Boze	Mariposa Co. Ag. Commissioner	email
080127-01	Bruce S. Dunwell	Private Party	letter
080128-01	Mike Wubbels	Exec. Dir. Stewards of the Sierra NF	certified letter
080130-01	Dorothy A. Walker	Love Creek Property Owner	email
080130-02	Michael Guillory	Forest Recreationist	email
080130-03	Merita Callaway	County Supervisor - Ebbetts Pass	email