

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/8/2023 2:53:33 PM

First name: Matt

Last name: Radlowski

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the forest draft assessment. I live in Missoula and access the Lolo Forest on a near daily basis for walking and riding my bike. I am participating in this process to help preserve current access and to advocate for expanding bike access and trail networks where it makes sense.

I appreciate the acknowledgement that mountain biking is a growing and legitimate use of the forest trails and that roads on the forest are not the type of experience that mountain bikers are seeking when visiting the forest on a bike. As an avid mountain biker, I agree with your assessment - I typically try to avoid roads (active or decommissioned) when recreating on my bike. My primary goal when recreating on my bike is to either access a bike specific (or bike optimized) trail with berms and other built features, such as those found at bike parks like Marshall Mountain just outside Missoula; or I seek out trails that are wild, technical, and more primitive. Trails like this are typically found in the backcountry - places like Carlton Ridge and Mill Creek trails, Heart Lake trail, Sheep Mountain and the East Fork to Rattlesnake trail, or the trails in the Silcox-Cube Iron area near Thompson Falls.

The research cited in the draft assessment regarding the projected growth of various outdoor activities (Cordell 2012) appears to be outdated and does not take into account the growth of various activities during the pandemic. Mountain biking has seen growth during this time period and the numbers reflected in the 2012 research do not appear to capture current growth trends related to mountain biking and other trail based activities. The forest service would be best served to find more up-to-date research on recreational trends that reflect the current participation and growth in recreational activities given the changes that have happened since the pandemic. The Outdoor Foundation's 2021 report on outdoor participation trends may be a good starting point (<https://outdoorindustry.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/2021-Outdoor-Participation-Trends-Report.pdf>). Additionally, the International Mountain Biking Association (IMBA) as well as the National Interscholastic Mountain Biking Association (NICA) may have more relevant data regarding growth in participation in mountain biking over the past 10 years - since the Cordell 2012 paper was published.

The use of the term "mechanized" appears to be used on occasion to refer to mountain biking, and is not an accurate term to describe this activity. The term largely returns search results that show images of tanks, war machines, tracked machines, and military equipment, and appears to refer to non-human powered machines ([https://www.google.com/search?client=safari&hl=en-us&q=mechanized&tbn=isch&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiU9ryxov\\_\\_AhVeADQIHcfPD0sQ0pQJegQIDRAB&biw=1180&bih=713&dpr=2](https://www.google.com/search?client=safari&hl=en-us&q=mechanized&tbn=isch&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiU9ryxov__AhVeADQIHcfPD0sQ0pQJegQIDRAB&biw=1180&bih=713&dpr=2)). In the avalanche education field, the term is used to describe snow mobiles (i.e. - mechanized Level 1 avalanche class is a level 1 class for snowmobilers). I'd like to recommend the forest use a more appropriate term to describe mountain biking and remain consistent in its use during the forest planning process.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the forest planning process. I appreciate your efforts to include the public as much as you have during this process so far.