

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/15/2022 10:27:25 PM

First name: Sandy

Last name: McGinn

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I support Alternative # 1 the no action alternative. I am from a ranching family in a community that is definitely agricultural-based. We know how hard it is to make a living in the best of situations. I cannot believe you're allowing a recreational complex system within the lemon creek drainage. That bike system is the size of Mount bachelor ski resort. The forest management area in this project are primarily general forest which gives priority to the timber and forage production. I know there's other areas that are designated recreational that you should've looked at.

I am aware of the conflict between grazing and mountain biking in the Mount Emily area. The grazing practices have basically been pushed out because of the recreational biking activities. The permittees had trouble with their fences getting cut, rogue trails being built, and cattle being chased by the bikes or their dogs that they bring with them. We have private grazing ground that we graze on, located near a public rest stop in Baker county and we have had problems continually with those fences being cut. The sheriffs department has been involved in trying to reduce the impact of the public. Along with extra use from the public comes the spread of noxious weeds in and inevitable trash. In addressing this proposal I'd like to know who's going to be responsible for the monitoring of the encroachments and user trails. The encroachments and user trails will undoubtedly happen. In reviewing all of the alternatives except for alternative one, the proposals all show the trail system being built on high elevations coming down to the lower elevations. The results of erosion incurred will be decades to come. Also I perceive a huge safety issue, there is no way Mountain bikes coming down a rocky terrain at 35 miles an hour is safe.