

Shoshone National Forest Travel Management
Request for Public Input

Ranger District: Wapiti, Clarks Fork, Greybull Ranger Districts

Current Proposals

1. Which proposal are you commenting on?

NZ-01 Line Creek

2. Provide comments below on the proposal:

Please be specific and provide rationale for your position. In other words why do you like for dislike about the proposal.

See attached letter

Wapiti Ranger District

NOV 30 2015

US Forest Service
Wapiti Ranger District
Travel Management
203A Yellowstone Ave
Cody, WY 82414

I am writing in opposition to the proposed new road between FS 140 and FS 121. I do support the repairs between FS 140 and FS 123.1B and the repair or relocation of the road around the private piece of ground known as the "Osborn eighty".

I am a resident in the area (Section 13 T. 57 N., R. 103 W.) and my property is within a half a mile of the forest boundary in which the new road is being proposed. I am also an avid elk hunter.

The reasons I oppose the new road are as follows:

1. This is one of the last portions of the mountain range to valley interface areas between the Montana border and the Chief Joseph Highway the does not have motor vehicle access. This provides a necessary escape route and rest area for the Elk herds in the area. These herds are already in decline due to Grizzly Bear and Wolf stress, what they do not need is additional human stress.

2. A new road between FS 140 and FS 121 will increase the traffic and noise in the area for local residents. It will also increase the amount of people ending up on our property looking for a short cut to the new road.

I live a half mile from the FS on the West, a quarter mile from BLM on the south, and boarder BLM on the east. I and my neighbors must pay an annual fee to cross the government property yet we must maintain the road across the BLM property at our expense, everyone else can access the BLM for free. Any increase in traffic on Bennett Creek Road, by those looking for access, causes a direct financial burden on the residents of the area.

3. The area in which the proposed new road will bisect is currently home to several Grizzly bear families. Having vehicle traffic west of the bears will only drive them further to the east, resulting in more bear human conflicts. My neighbor loses several cows a year to bears. My horses have been chased and my dog was attacked in the yard by a Grizzly bear this spring. We do not need people driving and chasing them down off the mountains.

4. The areas of this proposed road include steep rocky terrain. Removal of vegetation on the road surface will lead to increased erosion from wind and rain. This area is subject to winds in excess of 120 MPH and even a half inch rain can cause severe erosion due to the speed the water picks up.

Due to the speed of the water coming off the slopes I spend many hours repairing damage to my own roads and driveways after rains of a half inch or more. The area of the proposed road will be worse.

5. Cost to maintain the new road will prevent it from being maintained in the future. One only needs to look at the existing roads in the area (FS140, FS 123). These roads were so bad in 2011 that during the "Hole in Wall" fire crews were told not to drive on some of them, yet they were not repaired then, and still haven't been.

6. In ability to enforce that vehicles are to remain on the designated road due to the visibility restrictions from the terrain, especially in Sec 10, 14, 15, and 23. You only need to drive up to the end of FS 121 to see that the "No Motor Vehicle" signs are constantly broken off and look at all of the motor vehicle tracks in the area. The inability to enforce the travel restrictions will turn the hidden bowl into an ATV free for all zone increasing erosion and the other problems.

For these reasons I am opposed to a new road between FS 121 and FS 140.

Respectfully submitted,


Mike Specht

