

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/23/2022 11:29:00 PM

First name: Kamran

Last name: Tehranchi

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Hello-

I am submitting my opinion in opposition of the proposed east crazies land swap.

The proposed land swap would damage public access, increase private development of currently public lands, and further empower/enrich private organizations who seek to profit from currently public resources. Most importantly the land swap was organized in an essentially private process without public participation.

The Sweet Grass Trail #122 is has been a public trail for years as marked on USFS maps. In recent years private landowners have begun obstructing the public access to the trail. If the FS were to proceed with this land-swap, we would be giving up potential future access to the Sweet Grass Canyon access point. Although the politics of today give private landowners the upper-hand to bully and pirate previously public lands, if this land swap were to occur, we would forever be giving up the chance of reestablishing access in the future.

The land swap proposed doesn't provide a fair trade in the TYPE nor VALUE of land. The proposed new FS lands are in poor locations for public access in steep rocky regions where people wouldn't be able to access easily. We would lose access to are low elevation riparian lands which have plenty opportunity for fishing and other recreation like hunting and backpacking. Additionally the value of the lands proposed to give to the FS would be worth much less than the lands given to the private landowners because of the nature of consolidation. On the market- land that is at a mountain top is worth a lot less than land that has a road already developed through it. It doesn't seem the FS considered this in valuation of the land swap.

Most importantly, the land swap was organized in an semi-private fashion, and as with most private-public hearings and processes, those with the most resources (time, money) are the ones who are able to most strongly influence the outcome.

Are you eager to hand over public land to the Yellowstone Club for them to build luxury cabins for rich people? I am not. The status quo is better than a one-sided trade where the public gets the short end of the stick.

Thanks,
Kamran Tehranchi