

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/16/2022 10:03:57 PM

First name: Jacob

Last name: Lilley

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My first concern with this land exchange plan is the lack of administrative and public easements for the existing Sweet Grass Canyon Trail at the mouth of the canyon. These must be included in the plan for the benefit of the public and the Forest Service and they must extend from the existing trailhead to the newly created Sweet Trunk Trail. Without them, the only legal and confirmed access to the lower part of the canyon will be extremely long hikes from either the west side of the range or through the new Sweet Trunk Trail. Related to this is my second concern, which is the lack of a recorded commitment (i.e. written easements) by landowners to continue to allow reasonable permissive access via Rein Lane and the lower canyon trail. "Intentions" to allow permissive access to continue, as it is written in the plan, are simply not acceptable and are completely unenforceable if the landowners change their mind or sell the property to new owners. As an example, once the new Sweet Trunk Trail is complete, the landowners would be perfectly within their rights to discontinue access, citing the new trail as an established public access. They could also choose to let just one or two groups in and consider their permissive access obligations fulfilled.

Administrative and public easements on the existing lower Sweet Grass Canyon trail and permanent, legal access via Rein Lane are very reasonable requests given the benefits that the landowners stand to gain.