

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/18/2019 9:04:46 PM

First name: Rob

Last name: Gregoire

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I oppose the Crazy Mountain Ranch (CMR) part of the South Crazy Mountain land exchange. The Rock Creek Ranch and Wild Eagle Ranch parts of the exchange are a fair deal and I would support them as long as the CMR part of the exchange is not included.

The effect of including the CMR part of the exchange can be summarized as: The public will LOSE access to: 1) ALL fishing less than eight miles from the trailhead; 2) ALL fishing for naturally occurring fish in the ENTIRE Rock Creek drainage; 3) ALL elk hunting less than five miles from the trailhead; 4) ALL elk hunting opportunities in the ENTIRE Rock Creek drainage accessible without an overnight stay (unless you are super human or have horses), and; 5) The BEST elk hunting in the ENTIRE Rock Creek drainage.

In return the public will GAIN: 1) Secured access to a pair of lakes with artificial fisheries and no hunting opportunities (unless you beat the 150 to 1 odds and want to hunt non-native mountain goats in a location where they are acclimated to humans and attracted to backpacker's urine). 2) An inholding which has minuscule benefit to the public because it is extremely difficult to get to and offers no remarkable recreation opportunities.

While it is desirable to acquire inholdings, especially if they have lakes, nobody in their right mind would give away so much to do so! The CMR part of the exchange is decidedly not in the public interest and should be rejected.

Included with my above comments are two documents containing extensive information that wasn't included in the Preliminary Environmental Assessment (PEA) and a more detailed analysis of the PEA and additional informational material that were supplied to support this exchange. When this information is considered it is pretty clear that the CMR part of the exchange is not in the public's interest; it doesn't do what the PEA says it is needed for; and it shouldn't even have got this far because it fails to meet the criteria that the Forest Service is supposed to consider.