

LS_SDNM_RMP_1-17313

Name: Mr. Douglas Martin

Title: Founder

Organization: RSD Racing

Address: [REDACTED]

City/State/Zip: [REDACTED]

Country: USA

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Special recreation pertaining to competitive events.

Comment Number: 1

Cited Content: Under Alternative C, 1,141 miles (68 percent) of available routes would be open to motorized use, in contrast to 1,241 miles (74 percent) in Alternative B and 1,670 miles (99 percent) in Alternative A. Opportunities for beneficial outcomes such as enjoying exploration, risk-taking, and easy access to natural landscapes, would be similar to Alternative B and moderately less than for Alternative A. Alternative C continues to allow opportunities for nonmotorized, non-mechanized cross-country travel. Such travel, however, must be consistent with RMZ prescriptions and may be restricted if repetitive use leads to permanent routes. The application of designated access management in the Lower Sonoran Decision Area under Alternative C coupled with fewer access points could affect recreational use by reducing the level of cross-country travel opportunities that are available under Alternatives A and B. Limiting nonmotorized and non-mechanized access from private and State lands onto public lands to designated access points will affect recreational use. From Visual Resources on Recreation Management Opportunities for beneficial outcomes, such as appreciation of natural landscapes, would be much greater under Alternative C than Alternatives A and B as recreation and non-recreation facilities and developments would be designed and mitigated to a much higher standard of visual quality, principally Class II (42 percent of Lower Sonoran, versus 13 percent in A and 7 percent in B).

Cited Section ID: 4.17.5.1 Lower Sonoran

Comment Title: Special recreation pertaining to competitive events.

Issue: 10606

Comment:

I've searched the site and have trouble finding the section regarding competitive events. I was told there was a note included that would exclude competitive events completely. Below are my comments on this subject. First, I'd like to mention that thousands of people enjoy our public land for all types of events on existing trails and roads. I'm a representative for the competition venue. Assuming of course that when you say "competitive events" your target is motorized vehicles; I feel it important to mention that off road racing has been a part of recreation in this state on public lands for as long as I can remember. I was involved in the seventies and I'm still involved now. What bothers me about this entire process is seems a very few people are allowed to make a decision like this. There are over 340 million owners of this land and I'm one of them. Your public input process is a joke. If I hadn't stumbled onto this form by accident I wouldn't be

making this comment at all. I will be at the meetings as well, but my point is you are using an electronic, web based media to contact off road enthusiasts, but avoiding the off road websites. That makes about as much sense as asking for ideas on rap music at a rodeo. You are basing your decisions on information gathered at the wrong point of contact with the owners of these lands. Your site is very confusing. I've been searching for a half hour and haven't found an alternative yet. Yes, I may be digitally challenged, but that just proves my point even more. What if the majority of the people who use the trails are not computer orientated? Or maybe they spend their time out on the trail instead of behind a keyboard. To get a better sample of how the off roading public would like to see the lands and trails managed, you should contact them personally through off road websites, forums, blogs, etc, and also by posting information at off road events. Also by contacting groups like ATR, AMRA, Whiplash, etc. These are competitive users who also have a direct line to the general non-competitive public as well.

My comment on any one person or one group of persons deciding what the rest of the citizens can or cannot do on our public lands, it is, or should be, illegal. To deny an event based on the fact that it's competitive instead of direct environmental impacts seems like an easy way to eliminate the need for BLM personnel. After all, a permit creates work for the BLM in the form of EA's right? So, if you are not going to allow the events, will the decreased work load result in reduced work force in the BLM?

I'm not trying to be nasty, but please look at it through our eyes. The trails we wish to use are existing trails. A permit should be allowed on existing trails. Nobody I know of in our sport is against the "no new trails" rule. Each permit should be evaluated on an individual basis, and reasons given if rejected. This is the best way to get the off roading community on board with new regulations. You cannot simply say "none are allowed". If I used that mentality at work; reducing my work load by simply saying we're not doing that anymore, it wouldn't be long before I was living in the desert.

As I stated at the beginning of this letter, I'm basing this on what I was told. I cannot navigate this site well enough yet to find what I'm looking for. Your site designer has done an excellent job of making it nearly impossible for the average person to use it.

I do look forward to the meetings and helping the BLM manage the lands in a way that everyone can be happy.

special recreation permits for competitive events.

Comment Number: 2

Comment Title: special recreation permits for competitive events.

Issue: 10606

Comment:

I've searched the site and have trouble finding the section regarding competitive events. I was told there was a note included that would exclude competitive events completely. Below are my comments on this subject. First, I'd like to mention that thousands of people enjoy our public land for all types of events on existing trails and roads. I'm a representative for the competition venue. Assuming of course that when you say "competitive events" your target is motorized vehicles; I feel it important to mention that off road racing has been a part of recreation in this state on public lands for as long as I can remember. I was involved in the seventies and I'm still involved now. What bothers me about this entire process is seems a very few people are allowed to make a decision like this. There are over 340 million owners of this land and I'm one of them.

Your public input process is a joke. If I hadn't stumbled onto this form by accident I wouldn't be making this comment at all. I will be at the meetings as well, but my point is you are using an electronic, web based media to contact off road enthusiasts, but avoiding the off road websites. That makes about as much sense as asking for ideas on rap music at a rodeo. You are basing your decisions on information gathered at the wrong point of contact with the owners of these lands. Your site is very confusing. I've been searching for a half hour and haven't found an alternative yet. Yes, I may be digitally challenged, but that just proves my point even more. What if the majority of the people who use the trails are not computer orientated? Or maybe they spend their time out on the trail instead of behind a keyboard. To get a better sample of how the off roading public would like to see the lands and trails managed, you should contact them personally through off road websites, forums, blogs, etc, and also by posting information at off road events. Also by contacting groups like ATR, AMRA, Whiplash, etc. These are competitive users who also have a direct line to the general non-competitive public as well.

My comment on any one person or one group of persons deciding what the rest of the citizens can or cannot do on our public lands, it is, or should be, illegal. To deny an event based on the fact that it's competitive instead of direct environmental impacts seems like an easy way to eliminate the need for BLM personnel. After all, a permit creates work for the BLM in the form of EA's right? So, if you are not going to allow the events, will the decreased work load result in reduced work force in the BLM?

I'm not trying to be nasty, but please look at it through our eyes. The trails we wish to use are existing trails. A permit should be allowed on existing trails. Nobody I know of in our sport is against the "no new trails" rule. Each permit should be evaluated on an individual basis, and reasons given if rejected. This is the best way to get the off roading community on board with new regulations. You cannot simply say "none are allowed". If I used that mentality at work; reducing my work load by simply saying we're not doing that anymore, it wouldn't be long before I was living in the desert.

As I stated at the beginning of this letter, I'm basing this on what I was told. I cannot navigate this site well enough yet to find what I'm looking for. Your site designer has done an excellent job of making it nearly impossible for the average person to use it.

I do look forward to the meetings and helping the BLM manage the lands in a way that everyone can be happy.