

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 8/26/2022 8:23:33 PM

First name: Jeremy

Last name: Sherman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear USFS,

I noticed the description of the Pine Mountain Glade stated the area to be gladed has not been previously used for skiing. I appreciate this statement and I hope the USFS considers protecting natural backcountry zones that can and have been skied without development in the future, especially from being developed by groups like the GBA who, in return, make money off it. I spoke with a few locals from the Gorham area, and they confirmed this area has been poked around in, but is not a natural backcountry zone. Once again, thank you for including this information in the impact statement.

A few other questions/ comments -

\* 300 acres seems impossible to glade. Why is so large an area being designated for backcountry skiing? Is there a master/ further plan for this area?

\* The impact statement did not define what a "band" is, and the USFS staff on the call did not know the term. Can you update the impact statement to define what a band is? Is it an area of denser clearing? Does the 3" or less diameter requirement apply when making a "band?"

\*How can the public review how Backyard Concept and GBA make money from these glades? I understand folks have to make money, but GBA and Backyard are now making money off natural backcountry areas like Baldface and Cooley Jericho. I am curious how much money is being made from these areas and if this is a conflict of interest? Is this financial information available to the public? What kind of agreement does USFS have with GBA and Backyard? How does this differ from what a for profit company, let's say a logging company, would require?

\*Could I sell memberships to Third Hole and other swim holes if I start a group that modifies and maps swim holes (not trying to be fresh, just had to ask due to them both being included in this EA)?

\* GBA has changed rather drastically from a non profit who's original goal was to prevent illegal trimming. Many glades, such as Crescent, bought into this ideology. GBA is now very focused on the economy and making money off these same glades. Those who bought into the original "prevent illegal trimming" philosophy and developed glades now feel what they signed up for is not what they received. Where does the USFS stand on the change from illegal trimming to the economy? Has the USFS been cognizant of the change in GBA's goals? Is the sole reason for Pine Mountain the economy?

I realize not all of these comments pertain to the impact statement, and I did not mention most on the call to avoid bogging down the meeting. I am hopeful this comment period will be appropriate to start this discussion.

Many Thanks,

X