

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/15/2022 4:55:28 PM

First name: James

Last name: Collins

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The loss of the habitat in the sweet grass creek drainage would be very unfortunate in a state where so much of the lowland country is private. The US forest service has easements in place for accessing the land that is currently public and is neither maintaining nor attempting to maintain the trails and easements. I believe that the correct course of action is to work with landowners and at least attempt upkeep on these existing easements however being that the USFS has a visible record of just not doing that, I don't see it happening. The land swap is, financially, a very one-sided deal that benefits the few landowners involved as the low lands being traded for the high rocky peaks are far more broadly valuable in terms of grazing and recreation. With that said, If the options are to either keep the status quo with no easement access and checkerboarded public or to complete this land swap then the land swap is a better deal. If another option is for the forest service to actually do some work in keeping up easements and trail access points then that is what I would prefer.