

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/20/2018 11:00:00 AM

First name: Steve

Last name: Lamar

Organization: Upper Swan Valley Historical Society, Inc.

Title:

Comments: To: Sandy Mack/Rachel Feigley

Re: Mid-Swan Landscape Restoration & WUI Project

Date: December 20, 2018

Having lived, worked and recreated in the Swan Valley for over 42 years, there are many things that I support in this proposal although I do have some concerns.

I support the effort by the Forest Service to conduct restoration projects on a landscape scale over a 20-year period in the Flathead National Forest. I would like to see more [lsquo]Stewardship Contracting[rsquo] in order to give the local contractors a better chance of competing for the work proposed. I support actions on the ground that leave a functioning forest afterwards.

I am in favor of the various burning and planting projects [ndash] especially in regard to whitebark pine restoration.

I strongly support protecting our cultural resources scattered throughout the Swan Valley. There are a number of trapper cabins, historic trails, USFS buildings, etc. that deserve protections from any of the proposed activities. As the President of the local Upper Swan Valley Historical Society, I can provide input and information on the locations and descriptions of many of these resources. I have attached a document listing the known cultural resources in Swan Valley.

I am also in favor of protecting the grove of large cedar trees along Jim Creek in Township 21N, R17W, Section 6. These are probably the largest trees on the Swan Lake Ranger District.

I am strongly opposed to the proposed 60 miles of new roads in the Swan Valley. The landscape already hundreds of miles of roads in the valley. The proposed addition of more permanent roads would negatively impact many bull trout spawning and/or rearing streams including Woodward, Squeezer, Lion, Goat, Piper, Cold, and Jim Creeks. It would also negatively impact westslope cutthroat population streams including Whitetail, South Cold, Cooney, Piper, Pony, Cat, Dog, and Smith Creeks.

On page 5 of the Scoping Document, Cold Creek and Jim Creek are deemed [ldquo]functioning at risk[rdquo] because of existing high road density, yet, there are new roads proposed in those drainages.

Also, the proposed new roads above Smith Creek and Goat Creek are high in elevation and very steep. These areas are remote and wild country and should remain that way.

In addition, I am opposed to the proposed new roads that are in unroaded areas, especially those adjacent to the Mission Mountains Wilderness boundary. There is already a lot of illegal snowmobile trespass into wilderness, and the USFS has inadequate funds for law enforcement monitoring. Illegal snowmobiling in the wilderness will be worse if new road construction allows easier access.

I support the stormproofing of existing roads to reduce the sediment washed into riparian areas.

My wife and I own 18 acres in the NW corner of T 21, R17, Section 24. The adjacent Forest Service lands were formerly owned by Plum Creek Timber and extensively logged. I question the need for any thinning projects along the boundary of our property. The weeds are rampant in the USFS section adjacent and west of our land (spotted knapweed, hounds tongue, oxeye daisy, yellow hawkweed, etc.). These non-native invasive species continually invade our property and require annual effort to keep these weeds from replacing the native vegetation on our property.

Please put section numbers on the USFS maps in the documents so that people can better locate and understand the proposed actions and plans.

Thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely,

Steve Lamar

PO Box 1077

Condon, MT 59826