

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/26/2024 1:39:09 PM

First name: Trent

Last name: Spratling

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Hi there,

Taking public land and designating it to wilderness and/or removing recreational uses is actually taking away public land. For decades we have had trails and roads shut down or gated off to everyone or reduced only to hiking. In MT, many of these trails have now grown in due to lack of use (actual lack of use from hikers) and eventually they disappear. This makes it easy to remove the trails from maps. Dozens of trails in my area are now gone, removed from maps, and they did not need to be. The reasons for doing this from groups in favor are typically: protecting animals like bears, erosion, and personal preferences. The first is not significant when reading studies from the NFS in MT, the second can be managed, and the third should not matter. Of course there are others, but this is ultimately discriminating against different user types.

I have been in these public comment meetings in the past around the national forest land management and even though populations of animals (bears, wolverines, wolves) are increasing those in favor of reducing land usability still use it as justification. We all pay taxes, there are laws in place, and public land should exist for all user groups. Reducing where people can recreate makes no sense when populations are increasing and it is not inclusive. If there needs to be better enforcement or management, then let's talk about that vs punishing many honest and good users. By reducing use in public land we put a higher density of users in the same place. If trails and roads are going to be closed or severely reduced in user type, please ADD areas to recreate.