

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/26/2022 6:00:00 AM

First name: Marco

Last name: White

Organization:

Title:

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

USFS added letter text from attachment for coding purposes:

- 
1. My first comment is to recommend that all trail projects proposed by CBMBA , then approved by the STOR committee be available for public comment. The Forest Service has always maintained that any trail proposal from CBMBA be reviewed by all user groups such as ranchers, hunters, equestrians, hikers, etc.. Per the recommendation of the exiting Forest Ranger for Gunnison (Matt) was a strong proponent of creating the county's STOR committee to get input from all user groups to establish trail proposals that should be available for public comment. I am very disappointed and upset that the strong vetting process and time that CBMBA then the STOR committee have done has been significantly reduced by omitting some of their trail proposals. What happened to the Snodgrass and the Eccher trail proposals? Who/why have these proposals been omitted from public comment? Is there one or a small group of individuals that have control to override the vetted proposals from STOR? I want all STOR vetted proposals to be made available for public comment, unless there is some part of the NEPA process that precludes a particular proposal from being considered. If that is the case, the Forest service should make it clear to the STOR committee and the public in general as to why a STOR vetted proposal has been omitted from public comment. Do certain individuals have a secret power to dismiss certain trail proposals? If so, this is wrong.
  2. I want the Snodgrass reroute proposal to be included for public comment
  3. I want the Eccher Gulch//Granite Basin proposal to be included for public comment.
  4. I want the Upper Cement Creek to Crystal proposal included for public comment.
  5. I want the Dr. Park reroute proposal included for public comment. I am tired of trying to repair the muddy section that the trail is required to follow. The reroute would make the trail much more sustainable.
  6. I want the Lake Irwin Road Parallel Trail to be included for public comment. The need for this trail is obvious to get riders off the road.
  7. I am in support of the Deer Creek to Tent City trail; however, not happy that the trail section north of 738.2A was removed before public comment was sought. That removed section should be available for public comment.
  8. I am in favor of the Teocalli extension.
  9. I am in favor of the Budd Connection to Tent City Trail.
  10. I am in favor of the Cement Creek Trail Lower Cement Creek Trail to Caves.
  11. I am in Favor of the Bear Creek Reroute
  12. I am in favor of the Day Use Areas and Trailhead improvements
  13. I am not in favor of the Upper Upper to Brush Creek trail as is. The trail is not acceptable located parallel close to the road. The route for this trail should be what CBMBA proposed in order to make the trail much more acceptable to hikers and riders. Who/why was this originally proposed route changed. This is not transparent and should be transparent.
  14. I am in favor of the Strand Bonus to 409 trail proposal.
  15. I am in favor of the Reno Divide Parallel Trail
  16. I am grateful for the trail proposals that have been made available for public comment; however very disappointed that so much work conducted by CBMBA and the STOR committee seems to be ignored by exclusion from public comment. All STOR vetted proposals being omitted is not acceptable without transparency to the public. The public has gone through the process that has been directed by the Forest Service. To have any of these vetted proposals removed from consideration without clear transparency as to why they have been removed is not acceptable. Enable public comment on all STOR vetted proposals.