

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/19/2022 3:51:35 AM

First name: Paul

Last name: P

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As we continue to carve out more and more space for recreation, it should be addressed in a way that helps preserve our intact habitats and ecosystems.

What good is getting back to nature if we have shaped and contorted it to fit around our infrastructure to the degree that it's value is no longer valid?

Keeping our impact into existing corridors (highway 133) already fragmented by human encroachment is the least we can do when planning for long term projects that will forever change the way wildlife utilizes the landscape. Each mile of new trail should be equally offset with the decommissioning of redundant trail mileage elsewhere. The priority of habitat areas of concern (bighorn sheep, elk) should overrule recreation sprawl into underdeveloped areas. Shifting the focus away from new construction projects that continue to fragment and alter ecosystems should be more heavily factored into decision making. Instead lets find ways to utilize existing routes already on the landscape, and preferably in areas that are already fractured and fragmented by infrastructure. This proposal as many before have, takes liberty with our natural resources and continues to shrink the last remaining wild areas within the state for yet another recreation trail. The USFS refusal to hear any alternatives to the alignment of this trail is terribly disappointing and disturbing. By dismissing any alternative it severely limits the public engagement process. I think a review of this process is in order before any more actions are taken.