

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/12/2020 8:19:34 PM

First name: Dave

Last name: Colavito

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear Bill Avery:

Thank you for considering my objections to the Forest's Land Management Plan.

Badger-Two Medicine

As mentioned in my remarks submitted previously during the planning process, I think that the cultural & spiritual significance of the Badger-Two Medicine area to the Blackfeet Nation warrants managing it in close consult with them. It is my understanding that the Nation finds mechanized travel to be incompatible with their values for the area. Because I believe they should be given deference, I'm objecting to mechanized travel in the area and ask that you designate permissible only foot a stock recreation there.

My own experience in the area also suggests a best-use designation that prohibits mechanized travel.

Arrastra Creek

While I can't speak from direct experience here, I take it on good authority that Arrastra Creek should be included as Recommended Wilderness. I personally find the Scapegoat Wilderness to be spectacular, and with Arrastra Creek adjacent to it, it isn't a stretch for me to believe that a best-use for this area should be to have it included it in your recommendation for Wilderness. I ask that you do that.

Primitive Recreation Opportunity Spectrum

I find including mechanized permissible, writ large, within the Primitive ROS outside Wilderness Areas to be both concerning and inconsistent with traditional management and understanding. Doing so sends an unfortunate mixed message. It also risks foreclosing prematurely designating certain areas worthy for consideration of inclusion in wilderness system.

I'm objecting to mechanized recreation being included as acceptable within primitive areas, writ large, outside designated wilderness areas. Please rescind FW-ROS-SUIT-02 for that purpose and take a more targeted site-specific approach to analyses where needed. I also ask that any such needed analyses be completed within a reasonable period of time.

Wilderness Study Areas

I'm concerned that current language leaves open unnecessarily the degradation of WSA's in ways that could reduce their eligibility for future inclusion in the wilderness system. Until the U.S. Congress renders a determination, a WSA needs to be managed to maintain its wilderness character for potential inclusion in the wilderness system.

I'm objecting to insufficient language for managing WSAs as Congress had intended.

Please consider changing Desired Condition 02 to read "Wilderness study areas primarily offer opportunities for solitude; primitive and unconfined recreation."

Please also consider changing the Standard section to read: 01 Within wilderness study areas, maintain each area's wilderness character as it existed in 1977, until the area is either designated as a wilderness area or removed from Congress's Study Act; 02 Within wilderness study areas, maintain each area's potential for designation within the National Wilderness Preservation System, until the area is either designated as a wilderness area or removed from the Study Act; 03 Activities that diminish the historic (1977) wilderness character or potential for future wilderness designation are not allowed. New uses, permits or activities must be analyzed to determine effects on wilderness character and potential before they can be allowed.

In closing, I again want to thank the entire planning team for all their work. Overall, they've done a terrific (often thankless) job, and I'm obliged to them.

Respectfully,

Dave