

LS_SDNM_RMP_1-18311

Name: [REDACTED]

Title:

Organization: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

City/State/Zip: [REDACTED]

Country: USA

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Please define Byway in the glossary

Comment Number: 1

Cited Content: NB-1.1.3: No motorized competitive speed events would be authorized on the byways.

Cited Section ID: 2.9.2.2 Action Alternatives for National Byways (BY)

Comment Title: Please define Byway in the glossary

Issue: 10756

Comment:

There is no definition of National Byway in the Glossary. I also cannot find any maps of these existing byways. Please explain this part to me.

Competitive events near Ajo

Comment Number: 2

Cited Content: RR-1.2.10: Competitive motorized speed events would not be authorized.

Cited Section ID: 2.8.4.2 Action Alternatives for Recreation Management (RM)

Comment Title: Competitive events near Ajo

Issue: 10758

Comment:

I was born and raised in Ajo. I have had numerous conversations with people in Ajo about an off road race. I was asked by a member of the Chamber of commerce if there was going to be a race in their area. Every one I talked to in Ajo during the Red and White All Class reunion feels a race would be good for the town and as long as it's done in such a way as to not damage the desert, everyone was in favor of a competitive event. It does seem that everyone agrees truck and buggy racing would be damaging to the desert. I personally feel a course can be laid out on existing trails for vehicles under 60 inches wide and an event planned that would draw visitors and revenue to the town could be successfully completed.

I believe placing a moratorium on speed events should not be part of the planning process at all. It would be more suited in the implementation process. However, I'm against it completely and I appreciate the opportunity to explain why.

I realize there can be issues with racing. I also realize the crash in Johnson valley Ca. was a terrible experience for everyone involved, including the BLM. But to place a moratorium on "all

events having an element of speed” is just not the right course of action. There are many racing organizations that do very well in controlling their spectators, staging areas, and trash. The ATR (Arizona Trail Riders) and the non-profit clubs of the AMRA (Arizona Motorcycle Racing Association) are very good at what they do. They have minimally evasive courses with great control in their staging areas. Whiplash Off-Road Racing also understands these concerns and is in the process of making changes to their program. In the past, many issues have been settled through mitigation. I’ve seen ranchers paid to move their cattle, and were happy to do so. Damage to lands and plants have also been corrected through mitigation. Off Road racing, and other events, bring a lot of money to the surrounding towns. As long as mitigation is possible, these events should be allowed to continue. The entire country is going green and there’s nothing wrong with that. But to shut down off road racing in a state that has had racing in it’s history and heritage for many years isn’t the answer. Racing and OHV’s contribute millions of dollars per year in revenue to businesses state wide. To convert a quad from a “sport” quad to a race quad can cost as much as ten thousand dollars. Motorcycles also undergo changes to be more competitive.

I’m asking you reconsider the ban on racing and allow applications for permit to be looked at on an individual basis. I totally agree with a ban on new trails, unless the BLM feels new single track is needed. I am against closing existing trails unless they are redundant, cherry stem type or do excessive damage to the landscape.

I also think we’re losing perspective on managing these lands. The lands are public lands and the uses should reflect what the public wants, not just what the BLM managers want. I hope that doesn’t sound condescending, but it seemed as if the decisions had already been made at the public comment meeting I attended.

Thanks you, Douglas Martin

Converting Primitive motorized trails to non motorized

Comment Number: 3

Cited Content: RR-1.2.46: Up to 50 percent of the primitive roads (approximately 63 miles) would be converted to non-motorized trails. Trails could be developed to provide connector and loop opportunities for non-motorized users.

Cited Section ID: 2.8.4.2 Action Alternatives for Recreation Management (RM)

Comment Title: Converting Primitive motorized trails to non motorized

Issue: 10756

Comment:

I believe converting these trails will cause issues since there will inevitably be both on the same trail. If there is a need for more trails for non-motorized recreation, new trails would be best suited for this. If I’m going to go hiking in the desert or even riding my bike, I’d rather do it on a trail that is not already clapped out from motorized use. Plus, I feel pushing motorized people off their trails will only succeed in causing them to cut in new trails. Without the enforcement personnel in the area, this could not be prevented.

Special Recreation Permit

Comment Number: 4

Cited Content: RR-1.2.66: SRPs would not be authorized for motorized or non-motorized competitive events.

Cited Section ID: 2.8.4.2 Action Alternatives for Recreation Management (RM)

Comment Title: Special Recreation Permit

Issue: 10756

Comment:

I feel this is not part of a planning process. All areas of public lands should be open for SRP's with each evaluated on a case by case basis. Competitive events do not always cause damage and injury. Most serious and fatal injuries to OHV users on public lands happen because of head on collisions. This doesn't happen in competitive events with courses marked.

OHV area?

Comment Number: 5

Cited Content: RR-1.3.11: The Arlington RMZ would be established (60,600) for visitors primarily seeking dispersed motorized recreation or a family oriented riding experience in a remote Sonoran desert landscape.

Cited Section ID: 2.8.4.2 Action Alternatives for Recreation Management (RM)

Comment Title: OHV area?

Issue: 10756

Comment:

If this area is being developed as an OHV area, then there should be mention of SRP for competitive events in this area.

Not clear what is meant on this one.

Comment Number: 6

Cited Content: RR-2.1.17: Except as otherwise provided, motorized competitive speed events would not be permitted.

Cited Section ID: 2.8.4.2 Action Alternatives for Recreation Management (RM)

Comment Title: Not clear what is meant on this one.

Issue: 10758

Comment:

"Except as otherwise provided". I'm not clear as to the meaning of this. But since it sounds like no competitive events allowed, I'll comment on it. The entire process of allowing competitive events is covered in a SRP. Each should be considered on a case by case basis. There are areas near Painted rock where private lands border BLM lands giving these land owners possible opportunities to rent their lands as staging areas for events. That kind of thinking and planning minimizes the damage to public lands. Please do not forbid SRP's in relation to competitive events.