Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/13/2023 9:10:21 PM
First name: Ellen
Last name: Winter
Organization:
Title:
Comments: I object to the Draft Decision/East Crazy Inspiration Divide Land Exchange for the following reasons:

People who commented previously should have been contacted by the Forest Service about this 45 day period to "object." I learned about it late in the game, and have had little time to formulate my thoughts. Fewer objections may be received because folks aren't aware that they need to get their comments in. Objection period should be extended. Over 1,000 people commented before. The Forest Service should also be willing to estimate what percentage of the original comments were positive/negative, or mixed, and not hide public response from the public itself.

One access point on the east side of the Crazies is simply not enough! The overcrowding of roads, parking areas, and trails that will result in the Big Timber Canyon area will degrade that neighborhood and its wildlife habit, and it will lesson the enjoyment of hikers, hunters, and recreationalists who frequent the area.

Lengthened, steep approach hikes mean that only the most dedicated and athletic will be able to reach desired lakes, peaks, and watersheds.

Fire risks will increase as multi-day hikes become the norm.

I'm not convinced that the values of parcels being exchanged are equal, and I don't feel that the Forest Service has been sufficiently transparent as to how they went about determining them. It appears to me that property owners on Sweet Grass Creek will be unfairly rewarded if this exchange goes through.

Not enough is being done in this exchange to protect land that's being traded from public to private from future development. I'm unclear as to why "federal deed restrictions" are being used instead of conservation easements.

Continued permissive access to the Sweet Grass Trail is voluntary and limited (seasonal). There is no guarantee of future access if the property changes hands, or if owners feel that their private property is not being "respected." The lower trail would no longer be maintained by the Forest Service, and will fall into disrepair or perhaps be blocked by property owners. Why can't the Forest Service ask for deeded access to the Sweet Grass trail head, a parking area, and deeded use of the trail in exchange for those lower parcels going from public to private ownership? Why are we just giving this land and our access to it away?

Not all of us agree that consolidating higher elevation land is more important than access to usable lowlands and waterways for hunting, fishing, woodcutting, and recreation. These are supposed to be our public lands, and the public should have a say in how they wish to use them, instead of being told which uses are in our best interests.

I don't believe that the Forest Service has done all that it could to protect the public's existing access to its lands. Prescriptive easements appear to have been in place before property owners started blocking public access. It appears that there may be railroad easements as well. We are ceding access, not gaining it, with this exchange. And speaking of access, what about the Swamp Creek Trail?

Finally, this agreement would set an important precedent, and it's not a good one. Many trailheads are accessed by crossing private land: most of the ones in my neighborhood do (Elephant Head access crosses the 63 Ranch, to reach the West Boulder Meadows trail you must cross the Burnt Leather Ranch, which the Davis Creek trail also crosses). It's hard for the public to know which, if any, of these trails have deeded access. As Montana ranch

lands increasingly fall into the hands of wealthy families, conglomerates, and corporations, access to trailheads will continue to be denied. Court challenges may well be the best method for dealing with this, and relying on historical precedent should not be just for Native Americans (though I 100% support their right to access Crazy Peak).