

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/31/2022 8:02:43 PM

First name: Tory

Last name: Peterson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing in support of the ORIGINAL CBMBA plan. I am disappointed that it was changed and reduced by the Forest Service before the public was given a chance to review it.

I am frustrated that the Forest Service is so restrictive to mountain biking trails, when it appears to me that other more impactful groups are prioritized. Why are new trails so limited, and considered so impactful, when the Forest Service comes to our town council meeting to propose over a hundred new miles of roads in our forest for logging? Why are mountain bikes considered disturbing to wildlife but hunting is not? If I were wildlife, I think I would prefer to see a bike riding by than a gun pointed at me trying to kill me.

The Uncompahgre and Gunnison National Forest allows coal mining in their forests. Coal mining is literally synonymous with the most destructive activity to land and nature, as well as our climate through both the methane directly released and the carbon dioxide from burning coal. And this climate change, in turn, is leading to catastrophic fires destroying thousands of square miles of National Forest.

So shooting and killing wildlife is fine? Building a hundred miles of new roads, and cutting down thousands of trees to be sent to the lumber mill is fine? Mining is fine, even if it leads to climate change, and climate change is therefore fine, even if it causes the forests to burn down? This is what the Forest Service is telling me with their actions.

Meanwhile, some people would like to clear an 18" wide path through the forest to go for a bike ride, get some exercise, see nature, and have some fun, but that is considered too impactful?!

Seriously, how is this even possible? How are these decisions being made? Who are the individual people allowing this to be the reality? Can you, Forest Service employee, please help to restore the balance and sanity?

Thank you.