

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/14/2022 4:01:36 PM

First name: Christopher

Last name: Casey

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As a Montana resident, hunter and retired career Forest Service employee I am outraged at this proposal. I spent my career in part protecting our public lands. Pushing back on encroachments. Fighting trespass, unauthorized use. It was one of our main purposes as an agency. What has been done is sad and pathetic by the FS not defending prescriptive rights for access. That is the cornerstone that provides for public access. How can it end this mission for us?

I do not agree with the proposal. This is why.

Access to high elevation lands so many miles from parking makes it useless to me as a hunter.

Access requiring stock is useless to most residents and non residents.

The parcels being exchanged are not remotely equal in appraisal value for access, for actually seeing elk.

The State and FS should never trade away waterways, streams, rivers or wetlands. This proposal does that and is against the mission of the FS to improve and protect water output from FS managed lands.

This sets bad precedence for the handling of prescriptive rights cases and future land deals because it's a serious departure from historic management and involvement by the Fas to proactively protect public lands, water and access.

This deal knowingly would prevent hunters fair and reasonable access to elk that will move to the consolidated better private lands.

The Forest Service screwed up. This is not a good solution for me. At my age I could never manage access or pack out so all of this is meaningless to me as a resident hunter.

The EA documents are inaccurate in describing the actual visual values and property w water.

Please do not move forward without addressing serious discrepancies in this analysis.

It doesn't improve access, it makes it worse, it does not address enforcement of prescriptive rights we have and historically enjoyed, it does not protect water sources and wetlands the FS should be protecting, it really smacks of a deal that benefits the wealthy involved, not us.

Please develop an alternative that actually promotes hunter access and retrieval of large game and allows access to lower elevation parcels. Please do not trade off and water sources or wetlands we currently own and conserve.