Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/20/2022 4:28:08 AM
First name: Jerry
Last name: LADEWIG
Organization:
Title:
Comments: I object to the present plan as written:
1. not enough access points. It is not a good idea to send everyone down the same trail.
2. hunters who enter the new east side trail would have to go farther to legally shoot game. They cannot shoot game from the trail and have it run onto adjacent private land.
3. We should not lose access via the north side via the Sweet Grass Creek Road.
4. The lower land wil be lost making it harder for hunters and hikers to make use of the newly contiguous forest service land. Not all can go uphill for hours.
5. the Forest Service failed to make use of the option of prescriptive easements, making them permanent for the pubic's benefit.
6. It is not feasible for hunter groups to cluster at a camp in one place when they want to disperse to hunt. One group shooting can drive the game out of an area.
7. there is no permanent easement arranged for the proposed new, private land.
8. large game desired by hunters are more likely during the hunting season to be in the lowlands, which would become private, rather than living on the higher less food available locations as the new eastern boundary is about 7000'. I live at 5100' and elk come through my yard grazing on my grass as they move to lower elevations into agricultural pastures.
9. Not all hunters have a horse or mule string to pack out their game meat.
10. the land quality is not the same as proposed. High cliffy, or rocky, sagey areas do not equal lower elevation charateristics that contain forbs, grasses and vegetation favored by large game.
11. mineral and water rights should be retained in the public weal. However, there may need to be a mineral withdrawal on the public lands, like the Gateway Protection Act, to prevent development by private parties and disruption of the ecosystem.
12. I understand David Lueschen, owner of Switchback Ranch and Crazy Peak, may allow the Crow tribe to use Crazy Peak for their traditional activities but there is no formal agreement between Mr. Leuschen and the Forest Service that will codify this into the future.
13. Also, I don't see how the 500 acres near Big Sky figures into this. It would become private, part of the Yellowstone Club. This makes me bristle to think that our public land would be given to an exclusive, for rich people only, entity.
14. Larger tracts of contiguous public land need to be near population centers, like Livingston, Big Timber, and White Sulphur Springs. A purchase of the current private land would accomplish this. A swap does not necessarily do so .
15. The 1885 Homestead Act applied at one time, giving the public access to federal lands and preventing fencing on private lands, to prevent the public from accessing the federal lands. While there has been various interpretations over time, what happened to that? Is is negated? It mno longer applies?
I favor greater contiguous sections of public land for a remote, "wild" experience. While this proposal is well intended, I believe the proposal as written is substantially flawed. I suggest it be re-written and outright purchases be considered to achieve an outcome favorable to the public.
Thank you for reading and considering.