

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/7/2019 3:13:20 AM

First name: Brice

Last name: Jones

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear FS,

I believe personally that the Gallatin Forest Partnership, option C is the best option for the Gallatin Range. In it, 2 very important components must be kept to keep the entirety of the Partnership intact. They are:

West Pine Backcountry Area (3.7.18):

While the plan components for this area in the draft forest plan represent parts of the GFP agreement for West Pine, there are some key pieces of our agreement missing. It is important to the Partnership that the entirety of our vision for these landscapes be implemented; otherwise it threatens the integrity of our collaborative agreement. There are a few things that we believe must be represented in the forest plan, and there are some places

where we would like to see the draft plan components strengthened.

The Partnership agreement recommends allowing mountain bike use on the existing system trails in West Pine currently open to foot and horse travel only. While we understand the forest plan cannot make travel plan decisions, we would like to see some acknowledgment that this recommendation requires further action by the Forest Service. We suggest incorporating an objective with a specific timeline by which a travel plan decision will be made for this area to bring the forest plan and travel plan into alignment if the analysis demonstrates it is feasible.

The Partnership agreement also identifies two areas where new trail construction could be considered to enhance the connectivity of the West Pine trail network. Again, we understand that forest plan cannot make these site-specific decisions, so we recommend an objective regarding enhancing trail connectivity by identifying opportunities to connect existing trails to create loop rides or to connect to other parts of the trail network.

Livingston Peak to Mill Creek area:

Recognizing the relative lack of moderate semi-primitive non-motorized trails in the Livingston area, the Partnership identified some opportunities on the east side of the Paradise Valley, along the western boundary of the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness, where it could be possible to develop new non-motorized trails. However, in every alternative, the summer ROS maps included in Appendix A of the DEIS show a stretch of primitive ROS classification that will preclude this opportunity. This area roughly includes the sections of land surrounding Dexter Peak between the North fork of Strawberry Creek and Fire Creek.

Designating this area as primitive in every alternative does not present a full range of alternatives for consideration. We would like to see these sections changed to a semi-primitive nonmotorized ROS to allow for possible new nonmotorized trails if determined to be feasible.

Similarly, on the north side of Livingston Peak, there is a small area of semi-primitive motorized ROS classification where we envision opportunities for some nonmotorized trail development. The GFP would like to see this area included in the semi-primitive non-motorized ROS classification instead, to ensure the opportunity to develop new non-motorized trails accessible from Livingston if shown to be fiscally and ecologically sustainable.

Additionally in the Lionhead area, I think non-motorized recreation should still be allowed where feasibility of trail grade, steepness, and exposure allows it.

I also think the upper sections of the Yellowstone river that lie on FS and BLM property should be permitted for

recreational and fishing separately. Figure it out. Use the Beaverhead model or Rock Creek, but it needs to be managed it's not if it's when. Now is better than later.

You all are great, keep up the good work, even if you're a contractor reading this, you are appreciated here. The FS is a great organization. Thank you for your time!

Brice Jones