

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/1/2024 3:22:36 AM

First name: Kerry

Last name: Gallagher

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Rattlesnake National Recreation Area and surrounding areas.

Thank you for this opportunity to be heard!

I believe the upper Grant Creek basin and the ridgeline bordering the CSKT land from Murphy Peak to Triangle Peak should remain trailless. One of the tenets when establishing the RNRA was to provide backcountry opportunities for exploration, challenge and self-reliance in a naturally appearing landscape and I think leaving these areas trailless will uphold that tenet.

I don't think e-bikes should ever be permitted anywhere in the Rattlesnake for the same reasons.

As far as vehicle traffic on RS 99, I believe only forest service and mountain water vehicles should be allowed and the occasional search and rescue if necessary. I believe the mountain water vehicles' Access should be allowed only up to the point all the dams are removed, then they should no longer be permitted.

As far as road maintenance goes, I think RS99 should be maintained for potholes but only up to Franklin bridge. After Franklin bridge, I don't think there should be any maintenance. Also there should be no widening of the current road bed of RS99.

I've heard it mentioned that the FS is considering road building in particular on the Gold Creek side access points of the Rattlesnake. I feel like there are enough roads up into that area so no new roads should be created. I know road building stresses out wildlife and because we know that we have at least one and maybe more grizzlies in the area and I've also heard from time to time wolverines have been in the area, I ask that no new roads be built anywhere surrounding the Rattlesnake.

I would like evidence of historic use and occupation of the area should be retained. I don't know that I necessarily want signage but I definitely don't want any of the old homestead foundations being removed. I would like more information about native burial sites and their uses of the rattlesnake. I feel that would be very educational. Maybe just on the entryway sign at the beginning of RS 99, if information on the indigenous occupants of the area could be set forth on that information board?

I believe the FS should attempt to acquire additional lands adjacent to the present RNRAW boundary.

I don't think Sawmill Gulch should be opened up to cattle grazing. Cattle grazing introduces nitrates into the ecosystem, it reduces natural biodiversity, causes erosion, and sap water reserves.

I think we have enough trails and trailheads. I feel like the restrooms that we have serve as well I don't think any new ones need to be built though possibly the ones that we do have could be updated. I don't think any other administrative facilities need to be built.

I believe prescribed burns instead of logging is the best way to address fuel reduction.

I believe requiring leashes for dogs the first 1.7 mi up RS99 is an effective control of dogs. I like that once you pass that point that your dogs can be off leash as long as they are under control.

I noticed in the proposal a question about whether mountain water could add an intake at a point inside the NRA.

No. I don't think mountain water should be doing any new work in the NRA. I believe they are on the right path undoing the dams that they put in place the turn of the last century. Once those are removed, I don't think they should have any new operations in the wilderness area. The RNRA continues to heal from a century of logging, damming and homesteading. There should be no more man-made modifications in the RNRA.

Great Burn Recommended Wilderness Area and surrounding areas.

Please don't open up any part of the Great Burn Recommended Wilderness or it's bordering areas to any mechanized or motorized modes of transportation. I realize the Nez Perce district has allowed mechanized transportation in areas that border the Lolo district. I don't think that means the Lolo district needs to do the same to accommodate those mechanized uses in the areas bordering the NP district. The Great Burn is a proposed wilderness area. It is a critical corridor for a variety of wildlife moving from the Yaak Cabinet area as well as from other areas to the Bitterroots. There should be no road building and no motorized or mechanized uses allowed in the Great Burn.

Rattlesnake National Recreation Area and surrounding areas.

Thank you for this opportunity to be heard!

I believe the upper Grant Creek basin and the ridgeline bordering the CSKT land from Murphy Peak to Triangle Peak should remain trailless. One of the tenets when establishing the RNRA was to provide backcountry opportunities for exploration, challenge and self-reliance in a naturally appearing landscape and I think leaving these areas trailless will uphold that tenet.

I don't think e-bikes should ever be permitted anywhere in the Rattlesnake for the same reasons.

As far as vehicle traffic on RS 99, I believe only forest service and mountain water vehicles should be allowed and the occasional search and rescue if necessary. I believe the mountain water vehicles' Access should be allowed only up to the point all the dams are removed, then they should no longer be permitted.

As far as road maintenance goes, I think RS99 should be maintained for potholes but only up to Franklin bridge. After Franklin bridge, I don't think there should be any maintenance. Also there should be no widening of the current road bed of RS99.

I've heard it mentioned that the FS is considering road building in particular on the Gold Creek side access points of the Rattlesnake. I feel like there are enough roads up into that area so no new roads should be created. I know road building stresses out wildlife and because we know that we have at least one and maybe more grizzlies in the area and I've also heard from time to time wolverines have been in the area, I ask that no new roads be built anywhere surrounding the Rattlesnake.

I would like evidence of historic use and occupation of the area should be retained. I don't know that I necessarily want signage but I definitely don't want any of the old homestead foundations being removed. I would like more information about native burial sites and their uses of the rattlesnake. I feel that would be very educational. Maybe just on the entryway sign at the beginning of RS 99, if information on the indigenous occupants of the area could be set forth on that information board?

I believe the FS should attempt to acquire additional lands adjacent to the present RNRAW boundary.

I don't think Sawmill Gulch should be opened up to cattle grazing. Cattle grazing introduces nitrates into the ecosystem, it reduces natural biodiversity, causes erosion, and sap water reserves.

I think we have enough trails and trailheads. I feel like the restrooms that we have serve as well I don't think any

new ones need to be built though possibly the ones that we do have could be updated. I don't think any other administrative facilities need to be built.

I believe prescribed burns instead of logging is the best way to address fuel reduction.

I believe requiring leashes for dogs the first 1.7 mi up RS99 is an effective control of dogs. I like that once you pass that point that your dogs can be off leash as long as they are under control.

I noticed in the proposal a question about whether mountain water could add an intake at a point inside the NRA. No. I don't think mountain water should be doing any new work in the NRA. I believe they are on the right path undoing the dams that they put in place the turn of the last century. Once those are removed, I don't think they should have any new operations in the wilderness area. The RNRA continues to heal from a century of logging, damming and homesteading. There should be no more man-made modifications in the RNRA.