

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/16/2022 10:35:44 PM

First name: Roger

Last name: Furlong

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for the chance to comment on the ECIDLE.

I am strongly opposed to this PEA and the changes it proposes. There are many areas of concern and the public is getting the short end in several areas. Summarized are my concerns:

The public loses miles of fishable streams. Sweet Grass Creek will no longer be available for public use and fishing opportunities

The public trades high quality, low-land wildlife habitat for higher, steeper, less productive habitat. The better habitat for hunting will now no longer be available, only the less productive habitat.

The public loses hunting and angling opportunity (as acknowledged in the USFS's PEA). You admit these losses in the PEA. How can this be in the public interest?

The public loses more water rights than it gains. There is no monetary value assigned to the water rights in question, therefore, how can it be determined if the public is receiving fair value for the lost rights? It also violates Executive Order 12962 which states there should be no net loss of wetlands in land exchanges. In this PEA, there is a net loss of over 44 acres of wetlands, despite which analysis is used.

The public gives 100% of mineral rights and receives only 18% in return. Since mineral rights trump most other rights, this could result in future encroachments on public land. There should not be such an imbalance regarding mineral rights if the goal is to protect public resources.

The public gives up two important and historic trails and four administrative roads in return for one trail. How can this be in the public interest? Clearly this is tilted toward private property owners. Please do not capitulate to private interests here at the public expense.

There is no disclosure of land or timber value lost by the public. How can members of the public know if this is a fair trade if there are no values assigned to these resources?

Also, why are there only 2 alternatives presented? In most situations like this, there are several alternatives rather than a "take it or leave it" approach. Please go back to the drawing board and provide other options in this process.

This PEA is deficient or openly violates other laws and even its' own provisions.

Please send this PEA back to the drawing board to address the above concerns. It is clearly not in the public interest and excessively favors private property owners

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please take the public interest seriously and protect our resources.