

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/5/2019 3:33:39 PM

First name: Mike

Last name: Tlusty

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Comment on Custer Gallatin Forest Plan DEIS

Before sharing my comments on the forest plan, you should know, that I am a Montana full time resident. Not in the sense that I spend most of my time out of state, and own a vacation or part time home in southwest Montana, rather, I wake up every day at my home in Bozeman, and go to work all week, pack up the camping supplies, and head for the mountains on the weekends. I spend every waking minute contributing to local economy, happily paying my fees and taxes that help manage Montana's incredible recreational resources, and also doing my part to spread the culture of responsible recreation.

I am often worried as to the amount of grasp that out of state interest groups have, to bully, or pay their way into closing off access to those of us that have literally and figuratively built the means of access, just to have that access to them selves by buying private property bordering public lands, then launching missions for forestry management re-structure to essentially make the land inaccessible to the rest of the local recreation population. Wilderness has never been about impact and preservation as most of the wilderness advocates claim, as proven over and over by wildfires that completely destroy un-managed, and inaccessible forests, and everything in their paths.

If forced to choose one, Alternative E would provide the greatest balance of control and resource preservation and sustainable long term management, while still allowing access to those who fund the management effort.

A new alternative should be drafted to address the following deficiencies;

The Forest Service failed to provide a "No Action" Alternative.

The Forest Service failed to provide a "Preferred" Alternative.

Page 89 of the DEIS. Objectives (FW-OBJ-RT) 03. All alternatives (B,C,D,E) propose to close additional miles of roads which further limits access. No alternative was provided for comment which increased access opportunities.

Page 94 of DEIS. Objectives (FW-OBJ-REC) 01. All alternatives (B,C,D,E) propose to "Remove or relocate existing recreation facilities including dispersed sites. The "specialist report" recommended expanding camping and recreation facilities yet No alternative was provided to the public which would have increased these recreation opportunities.

I request the Forest Service provide a "No Action" and a "Preferred" alternative. I request the Forest Service provide alternatives that increase road and trail access. I request the Forest Service provide alternatives that increase recreation and camping facilities.

Do you know why "the last best place" is Montana's unofficial slogan? A quick look at the ratio between accessible back country designated areas and wilderness designated area, as compared to states that could easily be considered the "first worst place", with little to no multiple use access... there's no coincidence here.

Thank You