

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/13/2023 7:06:43 PM

First name: steven

Last name: ryan

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Reading through the proposal, I really don't see much benefit to the community in these actions. If this is mainly to protect the homes from fire danger, the trees closest to home should be the ones removed - especially the ones on properties backing to the NFS land. Leaving those trees and removing further ones largely defeats the fire protection purpose.

Taking out so many trees in a high usage recreation area while simultaneously removing trails will greatly degrade the enjoyment of users. Having a web of trails allows people to avoid bumping into others during high usage times, and having the trees in place by and large allows people to see other people should they choose a less traveled path. That's a major reason for people taking a walk in the woods and taking out large tracts of trees will take that tranquility away in the best and closest to town area for it.

We already have a degraded experience on the hike from Masontown to Rainbow lake, and along the Peaks trail near Breckenridge with the previous tree removals, and this proposal would mean losing a lot more great hiking area. We may or may not have a fire do the same, but at least then we would understand that as part of a natural cycle and not a man-made disaster.

I hope this plan isn't implemented, but if it has to be, a small percentage of living trees should be removed only in minimal strips to act as fire breaks to protect homes.