Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/11/2020 3:01:07 AM
First name: Connie
Last name: O'Connor
Organization:
Title:
Comments: July 8, 2020
Dear Mr. Avey,

First of all, thank you for the effort that you and your staff have put into the Helena-Lewis and Clark National Forest 2020 Plan Land Management Plan and for giving the public an opportunity to give input and suggestions. We are writing to object to several areas of the proposed plan. We sent in a comment in 2018 supporting alternative D of the forest plan revision.

Objection: I object to the boundaries for recommended wilderness in the Big Snowies WSA.
Remedy: The Neil Creek trail (#654), Blake Creek Trail(#655) and Timber Creek Trail (#676) should be included in the recommended wilderness. The Crystal Cascades Trail (#445 and #445a) should also be included in the recommended wilderness and the boundary aligned with the existing snowmobile area. The trail from Crystal Lake to the Ice Caves (#493) should be included in the recommended wilderness.
Why: My husband and I have hiked to the Ice Caves and they are unique geological features that we think should be preserved forever.

Objection: I object to the exclusion of Arrastra Creek as recommended wilderness.
Remedy: Arrastra creek should be recommended wilderness and the boundaries should be the same as the Upper Blackfoot Proposal.
Why: My husband and I hiked the trail along Arrastra Creek this summer and it definitely has wilderness characteristics. We saw grizzly, elk, deer, moose and wolf tracks all in the same large mud puddle. This area is contiguous to the Scapegoat wilderness and if it was recommended wilderness, it would allow wildlife a safe corridor into the Scapegoat.

Objection: I object to the exclusion of the Middle Fork of the Judith WSA as recommended wilderness.
Remedy: The Forest Service should adopt the boundaries in Alternative D, which includes 62,452 acres of recommended wilderness.
Why: If the Middle Fork of the Judith WSA was recommended wilderness, it would not impact existing motorized use adjacent to the area.

Objection: I object to an ROS of Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized for the LOCO Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area in the Crazy Mountains.
Remedy: The Loco Mountain IRA should be a Primitive ROS.
Why: A primitive ROS would not affect current uses and would also acknowledge the important wildlife values of this area.

We hope our suggestions will be helpful and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Connie and Richard O'Connor