

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/19/2019 6:00:39 AM

First name: Stacy

Last name: Bragg

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I support Alternative A-No Action Alternative, I do not support Alternative B!

This is not a fair balanced trade amongst the party's involved.

The loss of low country hunting lands does not work for the public. the sections 11,13, and 21 of Rock, Smeller lakes and Sheep basin is difficult to access due to very steep and rocky trails that are not even suitable for stock use. The availability of game other than a a limited amount of goat permits, will not be suitable to fair chase opportunities.

The other sections proposed for swapping would have very poor access and would be predominantly, rough high elevation slide rock, that also gets pounded hard by the prevailing Livingston area winds much of the year.

Also the swap of Rock lake would hinder the ability of the agriculture community to control, maintain consistent water flows with the forest service in control of Rock lake. The ability of the forest service to avoid liability issues with the head-gate have not been addressed here. The potential of Rock lake being but into a Recommended Wilderness Area, or a wilderness designation would all but destroy the ability to maintain this head gate and safely control water flows down Rock creek.

While I would like to see the opening of the 272 trail, but the recent debacle of the loss of single track motorized on the 267 Ibex to Porcupine trail, and not allowing motorized use on the new 267 trail and the proposed 272 trail, even as a stock user I find this trail is not a very good opportunity. I see a net loss of of recreational opportunities for the public on Alternative B. And absolutely no gain for multiple use recreation, that includes summer and winter motorized opportunities.

Three of the grazing permit holders were not included in the workings of this land swap and were only notified by mail of the proposal in August of 2019. This action is arbitrary and capricious in the lack in the amount of time and the ability of the affected lease holders to be part of the process.

The forest service does not need an administrative motorized easement up the North Hammond cr road, The forest can access the Rock creek drainage the same as the public does.

In section 3.1 dispersed recreation the claim of minimal snowmobile- Snowbike terrain is false, if not for the 2005 travel plan the Rock creek drainage would afford many winter motorized oppurtunties that were used pre 2005 travel plan. the 272 trail was groomed with double track snowmobile in the 70s before private land closures.

Section 1.5 the last bullet point , " Achieve the optimum landownership pattern to provide for the protection and management of resource uses to meet the needs of the nation now and in the future ( FSM 5402.1). " Is not a factual point, this is only an unsupported opinion by the forest service.

This land swap will affect wildlife patterns and have not been fully studied.