

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 6/3/2019 5:22:50 PM

First name: John

Last name: Daggett

Organization:

Title:

Official Representative/Member Indicator:

Address1: PO Box 208

Address2:

City: Glasgow

State:

Province/Region: Montana

Zip/Postal Code: 59230

Country: United States

Email: sherid74@gmail.com

Phone: 4062302061

Comments:

I generally support Alternative D because it emphasis is on non motorized and primitive use. However the Forest should allow the public to use existing cabins within wilderness areas for recreational use if they are not needed for administrative use. You let outfitters have exclusive use areas for their camps which can be a lot more intrusive than your historic existing cabins. Do not destroy them if you are not going to use them, let the public use them.

While I may have missed it, I think the Forest should continue to allow the State fish stocking program in mountain lakes to include lakes in wilderness areas. I think this is compatible with the Wilderness Act.

I do not understand why the different Alternatives define more or less maintenance of facilities, roads, trails, ext. I doesn't make sense. No matter which Alternative is picked, you should maintain these to the best of your ability per their classification with the budget you are given. Why does a facility or Trail get less maintenance if you pick Alternative D? Makes no sense to me.

Forest System Trails and Roads that cross private land should receive annual or biannual maintenance to maintain the public's right to use those trails and roads. This is particularly true where access across private lands is difficult such as the Crazies Mountains. Very up to date and accurate records should be maintained. Service should challenge illegal blocking of these immediately when it happens and take all necessary steps to correct illegal blocking of access to include legal action.

A long term Vision Plan to consolidate public ownership in the Crazy Mountains should be in this Forest Plan which would include setting up a Trust Fund with Land and Water Conservation Monies to purchase private in-holdings from willing sellers. This would actually take care of many of the access issues within the Forest Boundary. Access to the Forest might be included as a purpose of a Fund like this. Land trades should be avoided within the forest Boundary. They are splitting the baby and a cop out for the agency. Long term, purchase are much better and won't create the mess you have at Big Sky and the Yellowstone Club which are the results of land trades.

On Page 129, there is a Table which shows different areas with different Wilderness designation under the Alternative Plans. Why does Alternative D which is supporting the most wilderness have less acres in some of the areas than other plans? Cowboy's Heaven and Red lodge Creek or Hell Roaring are an example.