Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Sandy and Scott Sallee	Black Mountain Outfitters	216		In an outfitter meeting this month with the Livingston Forest Service, we heard proposals to close Wallace Pass trail until July 15! That is not spring that is mid-summer. See how these proposed closure can snowball? That trail was blasted out by dynamite, and is not a fragile area that cannot stand the ringing shoes of a pack string.	Absaroka Beartooth Wilderness	The upper portion of the Wallace Pass trail #58 holds snow until mid July because of the north facing aspect. This can cause safety issues and result in damage to the trail facility. However, The Forest Service in Alternative 7M has decided to not have a blanket livestock seasonal restriction, but instead leave it to the discretion of the District Ranger to determine if a seasonal closure is need to protect facilities and provide for human safety on a year-by-year basis.
Sandy and Scott Sallee	Black Mountain Outfitters	216		We have a specific comment on Pine Creek Lake trail, as we live a couple of miles for the trailhead. Closing the trail to horseback users seems to be based on the heavy use of hikers on this hugely popular trail. It is also popular with people who cannot walk the five intense miles to the lake. This trail has a very solid rock base and can easily withstand both horses and foot traffic. It is rare to see more than a handful of hikers above Pine Creek Falls, and even fewer hikers appear after Labor Day weekend. Horseback riders, however, have been using the trail to hunt mountain goats in the fall for many decades.	Absaroka Beartooth Wilderness	According to our National Visitor Use Monitoring (2001) and Wilderness Ranger encounter data, the trail receives an average of 200 people/day in the summer. Given this amount of use, there is a concern for public safety relative to horse and hiker encounters. In Alternative 7M, the trail would be open to livestock beginning 9/15 through 12/1. This will accommodate hunting, but also reduce the safety concern relative to livestock and hiker use.
Rich Inman et al	Gallatin Valley Back Country Horsemen	428a		Pine Creek Lake Trail - This trail has been used by stock just short of forever; long before it became a popular hiking trail. Who determined it is "not suited to pack and saddle stock use…"? What were their qualifications? Instead of closure to stock, we recommend the multiple use sharing system that we suggested in the Lava Lake scenario.	Absaroka Beartooth Wilderness	According to our National Visitor Use Monitoring (2001) and Wilderness Ranger encounter, the trail receives an average of 200 people/day in the summer. Given this amount of use, there is a concern for public safety relative to horse and hiker encounters. In Alternative 7M, the trail would be open to livestock after beginning 9/15 through 12/1. This will accommodate hunting, but also reduce the safety concern relative to livestock and hiker use.
Greg Sauer		200	Woodland Park, CO	First, with respect to the Crazy Mountains, you neglected to include Rock, Trespass, and Cottonwood Creek trails in your motorized prohibition. These trails- particularly Cottonwood Creek- represent unacceptable "cherry stems" of motorized access into the area, thus compromising its overall ecological integrity.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on Rock Creek Trail #270, prohibiting motorcycles on Smellar Lake #220, prohibiting motorized uses beyond the existing road bed on Cottonwood Creek Trail #197, and prohibiting motorized use on the Trespass trail #268. There is a mixed ownership pattern associated with the Cottonwood trail. The Forest Service must provide reasonable access to private lands.
Al Pendergrass		28	Livingston	Trespass Trail in the Crazies: ATVs should not be allowed on this trail. I have been riding mountain	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				bikes on that trail for several years and have watched with dismay as the ATVs have turned it from a beautiful single track into an eroded, short-cutted doubletrack.		reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268.User created double tracks will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes. Closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites.
Todd Smith		978	Livingston	The winter travel plan should provide for continued use of snowmobiles for all of the East Crazies, Ibex and Shields. This would keep uses spread out over a large area.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of snowmobile opportunities in the Crazies, Alternative 7M allows snowmobiling in the Shields, Ibex and East Crazies. Some area closures are in place to protect the cultural integrity of high peak areas.
Brent Smith		979	Livingston	Summer use has already been greatly restricted by the OHV decision and no further restrictions are needed. Summer use in the Crazies should allow 4 wheeler and motorcycle use.	East Crazies	To provide for a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles and ATVs on specific trail locations. In 7M motorcycles are allowed on the North Rock Trail #270 and the Porcupine Lowline #267. ATV and motorcycle loop opportunities will be provided in the Shields area of the Crazies.
Daniel Thums		988	Livingston	Trespass trail in the Crazies should be off limits to ATVs that are currently having a major effect on the resource. They are rapidly turning a single track trail into a road.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268 due to tribal interests and cultural sites. User created double tracks will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes.
Catherine Weeden		1604		The plans to keep the East Crazies motor-free are forward-looking and wise. However, having motorized traffic on the Trespass Ck., Cottonwood Ck., and Rock Ck. Trails is not. These trails are very steep. You can see four tracks along the meadows in Trespass Creek. There are places where motorized traffic is appropriate, but high alpine single track trails are not among them. Please protect the Crazies from de facto roads.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268.User created double tracks will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of road in section 9. In 7M motorcycles are allowed on the Rock Creek North Trail #270 but not on Smeller Lake Trail #220.ATVs are not allowed in the Rock Creek drainage.
Josh O'Neill		1110	Livingston	The main places that I don't want to see closed are Rock Creek in Paradise Valley and also anywhere in the Crazy Mountains. These are my two favorite areas to ride. I don't see why these areas are being closed. It's not like there are that many skiers in there to begin with.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of winter recreation use including both quiet cross country skiing and snowmobiling, Alternative 7M reconfigures snowmobiling in the Crazies by providing groomed routes as well as other snowmobiling opportunities in the Cottonwood/Ibex and Shields areas. Winter closures provide quiet skiing

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						opportunities out of Porcupine cabin as well as into the Sunlight drainage. Alternative 7-M would allow snowmobiling in the South Rock Creek drainage.
Sharon Rennie		1500	Wilsall	The Sunlight area needs left as a motorized road. Landowners need access to summer pasture and for fence repair. Also, it is a great hunting area.	East Crazies	The Sunlight Road #6630 is to be managed as a public backcountry road up to the Sunlight Trailhead. The roads near or past the trailhead are to be managed for project use (public motorized use is prohibited). The DEIS, Chapter 4 includes a section that addresses the potential effects on extractive uses such as livestock grazing. In general we were cautious in the travel plan alternatives not to make decisions in principle about the management of other resources that are more appropriately addressed in Forest Plan revision or during project specific analysis. This planning process focuses on travel within the forest. It is not a planning process for livestock grazing, permitted uses or other programs. The Livingston Ranger District will work with private landowners for access to pasture or fence repair on a case by case basis. The hunting aspect of this area is outside the scope of this travel planning process.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Rock Cr N. Trail #270 - this trail could be opened to motorcycle use approximately one mile farther to a natural Terrain Boundary. Using NTBs virtually eliminates enforcement issues. This last mile is a valuable and meaningful trail opportunity for motorcycle riders.	East Crazies	In 7M the North Rock Trail #270 is open to motorcycles up into Section 10 near the natural terrain boundary.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Cottonwood Lk Trail #197 - There are currently only 3 lakes open for motorcycle access in the whole Crazy Mnt. Range - Closing this trail would eliminate the most popular of these.	East Crazies	In 7M Cottonwood Lake Trail #197 will be open to ATV and motorcycles on the roadbed into Section 9. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles due to tribal interests and cultural sites. In 7M the North Rock Trail #270, which provides access to a lake, the Porcupine Lowline #267 and a portion of the Shields Lowline #258 will be open to motorcycles.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Sunlight Lk Trail #260 - Use Natural Terrain Boundary instead of currently proposed boundary. Using NTBs virtually eliminates enforcement issues. This would allow trail users to ride close enough to Sunlight Lake that they could then easily hike in and out in an afternoon (an important type of opportunity).	East Crazies	In 7M, the Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking and motorcycles will be prohibited. The Shields Lowline #258 will be open to motorcycles from the Porcupine cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead. User education and enforcement will be important in the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						implementation of the travel plan, regardless of the alternative selected.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		SF Shields Trail 265 - Please allow motorcycle access in this drainage. This trail sees very little use from any other user group.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Porcupine Cabin trailhead to the Sunlight Trailhead. Motorcycles would also be allowed on the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 from Ibex to Porcupine Cabin. The South Fork of the Shields is being managed for stock users and hikers to provide for non-motorized opportunities and to protect cultural resources in the high alpine basins.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Smeller Lake/Rock Lake Zone - Sees very little winter use - will not hurt anything to leave open. A small but important area to local snowmobiles. A partial/seasonal closure OK - to prevent low country damage in low snow times.	East Crazies	The Smeller/Rock Lake area currently has some winter recreational use occurring, especially from local snowmobilers. Cultural integrity of the high peaks and unsuitable access through private lands were rationale for snowmobile closures in the Rock Creek drainage.
Brian Sobrepena		1557		I do want to thank you for keeping the rock creek trail in the crazy's open to smeller lake. This place is like my church. What a special spiritual place. Please don't change the trail - it's very smooth.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Rock Creek North Trail #270 to a natural occurring boundary in Section 10. The trail will continue to receive maintenance on the existing trail tread such as rock removal and cleaning drain dips and water bars. Motorcycles will not be allowed on Smeller Lake Trail #220. ATVs are not allowed in the Rock Creek drainage.
David Strong		1574		The FS should not allow motorized use of the trails in the Crazy Mountains. I think the travel plan should emphasize the need for more trails in the crazies, especially in the foothills. These trails would enhance the kind of two or three day loop trips that would be a wonderful improvement for the crazies.	East Crazies	The rationale for the Crazies is to provide for a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole. The travel plan evaluated all the current system trails in the Crazies and added some loop opportunities in the Shields. The lowline trails are currently in the foothills and provide connector routes to other system trails.
David Strong		1574		The Smeller Lake Trail is a great trail to hike in and of itself. The redesigned Rock Creek Trail has been a boon for hikers since they no longer have to ford the creek so many times. The high lake confines humans, especially campers, to a very small area. Motorbikes will fill this valley and cirque with unwelcome noise and smells. Severe conflicts and compromises are unavoidable.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Rock Creek North Trail #270 to a natural occurring boundary in Section 10. Motorcycles will not be allowed on Smeller Lake Trail #220. ATVs are not allowed in the Rock Creek drainage.
David Strong		1574		I say let's encourage this kind of route rather than discourage it by allowing motorbikes, ATVs and	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				snowmobiles to use the Smeller Lake Trail. Using Smeller Lake via Twin Lakes, Cottonwood Lake, and Rock Lake would enable people from the east side to actually make a loop trail from Half Moon campground through the high peaks of the Crazies.		reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Rock Creek North Trail #270 to a natural occurring boundary in Section 10. Motorcycles will not be allowed on Smeller Lake Trail #220 to protect cultural resources and provide for a high quality goat hunt. ATVs and snowmobiles are not allowed in the Rock Creek drainage. Cultural integrity of the high peaks and unsuitable access through private lands were also rationale for snowmobile closures in the Rock Creek drainage.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Smeller Lake Trail 220 and Rock Creek in North Trail 270 segments one, two and three: Snowmobile travel is possible in this drainage during the years with adequate snowfall. These two drainages combined would provide an excellent opportunity for a whole day ride from one location.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses. ATVs and snowmobiles are not allowed in the Rock Creek drainage. Cultural integrity of the high peaks and unsuitable access through private lands were also rationale for snowmobile closures in the Rock Creek drainage. In 7M Smeller Lake Trail #270 will be closed to all motorized uses to protect a quality goat hunting experience and cultural resources.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Sunlight Ridge Trail 260 segments one and two: this drainage would provide a more challenging snowmobile riding area to the Shields River Area.	East Crazies	In 7M, the Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. For winter, this area is being managed to balance opportunities for skiers and snowmobiles. The Sunlight Creek/South Fork shields area would be restricted to snowmobiles in favor of providing a segregated, quiet cross country skiing opportunity. The majority of the Shields provides a significant amount of snowmobile opportunities.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Southfork Shields Trail 265: this drainage would also provide a more challenging snowmobile riding area to further complement Shields River Trail system.	East Crazies	The Sunlight Creek/South Fork Shields area would be restricted to snowmobiles in favor of providing a segregated, quiet cross country skiing opportunity. The majority of the Shields loop and a portion of the Ibex area provides a significant amount of snowmobile opportunities.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Cottonwood Lake Trail 197 segment two: from the end of private section to the lake should remain open to motorcycle travel for fishing opportunities. First part of the trailed means minor work (switchback repair) the remainder is in excellent shape.	East Crazies	In 7M Cottonwood Lake Trail #197 will be open to ATV and motorcycles on the roadbed into Section 9. From this point, (segment 2) the switchbacks will be repaired but the trail will be closed to motorcycles due to tribal interests and cultural sites. In 7M the North Rock Trail #270, which provides access to a lake, the Porcupine Lowline #267 and a portion of the Shields Lowline #258 will be open to motorcycles.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Sunlight Ridge Trail 260 segments one and two: motorcycle travel is possible from trailhead to one half mile from ridge at district boundary allowing for easy hike to lakes and fishing opportunities.	East Crazies	In 7M, the Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking and motorcycles will be prohibited. The Shields Lowline #258 will be open to motorcycles from the Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Southfork Shields Trail 265: motorcycle trail off of Shields Low Line trail 258 to upper meadows in basin with beautiful views of drainage	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Porcupine Cabin trailhead to the Sunlight Trailhead. Motorcycles would also be allowed on the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 from Ibex to Porcupine Cabin. The South Fork of the Shields is being managed for stock users and hikers to provide for non-motorized opportunities and to protect cultural resources in the high alpine basins.
Greg Beardslee		737		Sunlight Peak Trail: hardly anyone rides up here, so why close it? Every year some friends of mine bicycle up to the divide near Sunlight peak in the Crazies. My take on this is that uses so occasional on this trail by anyone that no one needs to be banned.	East Crazies	In 7M, the Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking and motorcycles will be prohibited. The Shields Lowline #258 will be open to motorcycles and mountain bikes from the Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead.
Bruce Kron		1376		The Sunlight Ridge Trail #260 in the Crazies must remain in its present status two best allow multiple use by outdoor enthusiasts. Historical motorized use allow us to enjoy the fishing and scenery as in the past.	East Crazies	In 7M, the Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking and motorcycles will be prohibited. The Shields Lowline #258 will be open to motorcycles and mountain bikes from the Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead.
Bruce Kron		1376		The open space a snowmobiling areas of the Crazies is crucial to allowing a wide variety of opportunity without over impacting smaller areas.	East Crazies	The majority of the Shields loop and a portion of the Ibex area provides a significant amount of open space snowmobile opportunities. The Sunlight Creek/South Fork Shields area would be restricted to snowmobiles in

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						favor of providing a segregated, quiet cross country skiing opportunity.
Mike Mather		1415	Wilsall	This new proposal will affect my ranch operation to the point that I may need to sell. Some of the land belonging to our ranch is involved in the boundaries of the new proposal. This land would be landlocked and not of any use to the ranch. For the past 50 years I have not seen any problem using the Crazy mountains as a multi use area. I truly believe that this issue should be reconsidered	East Crazies	We're not quite sure how travel planning will affect this ranch operation or what boundaries this individual is making reference to regarding private property. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range and private lands must be respected. Efforts are being made to work with private land owners with specific concerns on specific travel routes. One purpose of the travel management plan is to provide for a broad spectrum of recreational opportunities for both motorized and non motorized uses. The focus of travel planning is on travel within the Forest. It is not a planning process for timber, fuels, livestock grazing, minerals, lands, permitted uses or other programs.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Rock Creek Drainage: Trail 270 up to the intersection of trail 220 Smeller Lake. In alternative seven, you leave trail 220 two Smeller Lake open to bikes and close the remaining portion of 270 to Rock Lake to bikes. Due to the nature of both trails and a habitat they pass through we recommend of allowing motorbikes to continue up trail 270 toward Rock Lake and closed motorized access to the more remote and rugged trail 220 two Smeller Lake. The meadows just below Smeller Lake are more susceptible to damage (and have already been damaged) by motorized use than the terrain toward Rock Lake. both sections of trail are about the same link, this change would allow the same amount of motorized use, but would directed to in area of less potential resource damage. Currently Smeller Lake is one of the more remote and out-of-the-way goat hunting destinations in the Crazies; goat hunters have complained and been disappointed by the impacts of motorized access to Smeller Lake.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Rock Creek North Trail #270 to a natural occurring boundary in Section 10. Motorcycles will not be allowed on Smeller Lake Trail #220 to protect cultural resources and provide for a high quality goat hunt. ATVs and snowmobiles are not allowed in the Rock Creek drainage. Cultural integrity of the high peaks and unsuitable access through private lands were also rationale for snowmobile closures in the Rock Creek drainage.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We oppose the proposal for the partially motorized, partially motor-free trails on the west slope of the Crazies (Trails #197, 268, and 270) for several reasons. First, as stated above, it is not consistent with the status of the area as Crow sacred ground. Second, it creates an impractical enforcement situation where trespass into motor-free areas is practically guaranteed. Third, it would threaten the	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268.User created double tracks will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of the road in section 9 on Cottonwood Trail

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				integrity of the Trespass and Cottonwood basins and disrupt quiet trail use while providing only a limited motorized opportunity. The proposal would only offer a few mile of motorized trail, inviting trespass by motorized users onto the motor-free portions of the trails in search of quality experience. Fourth, it would accelerate trail degradation. Our observations indicate that the Trespass Creek Trail, which was originally a single-track trail, is being widened in spots by ATV traffic; each year more of the trail becomes a two-track.		#197. In 7M motorcycles are allowed on the Rock Creek North Trail #270 but not on Smeller Lake Trail #220. ATVs are not allowed in the Rock Creek drainage.
Joe Polus		1487		Rock Creek North Trail #270 - This trail could be open to motorcycle use approximately 1 mile farther to a Natural Terrain Boundary to eliminate enforcement issue. This last mile is a valuable and meaningful trail opportunity for motorcycle riders.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Rock Creek North Trail #270 to a natural occurring boundary in Section 10. Motorcycles will not be allowed on Smeller Lake Trail #220. ATVs are not allowed in the Rock Creek drainage.
Joe Polus		1487		Cottonwood Lake Trail #197 - There are currently only 3 lakes open for motorcycle access in the whole Crazy mountain Range - Closing this trail would eliminate the most popular of these.	East Crazies	In 7M Cottonwood Lake Trail #197 will be open to ATV and motorcycles on the roadbed into Section 9. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles due to tribal interests and cultural sites. In 7M the North Rock Trail #270, which provides access to a lake, the Porcupine Lowline #267 and a portion of the Shields Lowline #258 will be open to motorcycles.
Joe Polus		1487		Sunlight Lk Trail #260 - Use natural Terrain Boundary instead of currently proposed boundary to eliminate enforcement issues. This would allow trail users to ride close enough to Sunlight Lake that they could them easily hike in and out in an afternoon (an important type of opportunity).	East Crazies	In 7M, the Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking and motorcycles will be prohibited. The Shields Lowline #258 will be open to motorcycles and mountain bikes from the Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead.
Joe Polus		1487		South Fork Shields Trail 265 - Please allow motorcycle access in this drainage. This trail sees very little use from any other user group.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Porcupine Cabin trailhead to the Sunlight Trailhead. Motorcycles would also be allowed on the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 from Ibex to Porcupine Cabin. The South Fork of the Shields is being managed for stock users and hikers to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						provide for non-motorized opportunities and to protect cultural resources in the high alpine basins.
Joe Polus		1487		Smeller Lake/Rock Lake Zone - Sees very little winter use - will not hurt anything to leave open. A small but important area to local snowmobilers. A partial/seasonal closure OK - to prevent low country damage in low snow times.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses. ATVs and snowmobiles are not allowed in the Rock Creek drainage. Cultural integrity of the high peaks and unsuitable access through private lands were also rationale for snowmobile closures in the Rock Creek drainage. In 7M Smeller Lake Trail #270 will be closed to all motorized uses to protect a quality goat hunting experience and cultural resources.
Steve Caldwell		618	Livingston	I support any proposal that closes Trespass Creek to motorized use. What was, until relatively recently, a 10-20 inch wide trail that provided an excellent hike or intermediate level mountain bike opportunity is now a road, and several meadows show extensive use of off-trail travel. In addition, at least two user trails that have appeared across meadows have become full-fledged roads as well.		To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. Motorized routes not specifically designated for motorized uses in the travel plan decision would be prohibited under Alternatives 2 through 7-M. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with these restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. Trail facilities that are not identified for non-motorized travel would likely be rehabilitated at their junction with system trails. User created double tracks that veer off the system trail will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track system trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes. In 7M ATV and motorcycle use is allowed on Trail #197 but is truncated where the road section ends in section 9.
Greg Beardslee		737		Sunlight Peak Trail: My take on this is that use is so occasional on this trail by anyone that no one needs to be banned.	East Crazies	Campsite inventories, ranger encounters and the National Visitor Use survey performed in 2002 would indicate that the high alpine lake basins in the Crazies receive a substantial amount of use. In 7M, the Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking and motorcycles will be prohibited.
Alaina Lammer Knight		629		Keep Cottonwood, Trespass Creek and Rock Creek in the Crazies open to quiet recreation only. Do not allow motorized use on these trails.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268.User created double tracks will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of the road in section 9 on Cottonwood Trail #197.These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. In 7M motorcycles are allowed on the Rock Creek North Trail #270 but not on Smeller Lake Trail #220. ATVs are not allowed in the Rock Creek drainage.
Calvin and Mary Sarver		634		One of the trips we enjoy is driving the loop road. We can see wild flowers in the spring and some animals. The road has become almost impassable the last few years. We would like to see this road improved rather than let further deteriorate.	East Crazies	In 7M, the Shields Loop Road is divided into four sections. Section 1,2 and Section 4 are to be maintained for passenger cars. Section 4 provides access to the Shields campground. Section 3 from the Shields campground to the Lodgepole trailhead will be managed as a backcountry road and will have dual designation as a road and trail.
Joseph Scalia III		635	Livingston	Cottonwood Creek in the Crazies shows significant trail degradation (and consequently creek situation) from motorized use past the end of the road. I suggest that all motorized be stopped at the end of this road. The trail beyond this is far too steep and of such a soil content as to be incapable of bearing the impact of ORVs.	East Crazies	In 7M Cottonwood Lake Trail #197 will be open to ATV and motorcycles on the roadbed into Section 9. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs due to tribal interests and cultural sites.
Robert D. Hughes		667	Livingston	East Crazies Travel Area: Cottonwood Creek Trail #197; Motorized travel should not be allowed on this trail. To permit motorcycles and ATVs on this traditional, quiet use single-track is clearly unsuitable.	East Crazies	In 7M Cottonwood Lake Trail #197 will be open to ATV and motorcycles on the roadbed into Section 9. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs due to tribal interests and cultural sites.
Robert D. Hughes		667		Trespass Creek Trail #268: Motorized travel should not be allowed on this trail. To permit motorcycles and ATVs on this trail is unsuitable because the traditional use for years has been hiking and horseback riding. This fragile alpine country is easily disturbed by motorized vehicles, and ATVs have already turned portions of this trail into a messy road.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. Motorized routes not specifically designated for motorized uses in the travel plan decision would be prohibited under Alternatives 2 through 7. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with these restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. Trail facilities that are not identified for non-motorized travel would likely be rehabilitated at their junction with system trails. User created double tracks that veer off the system trail will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track system trail will be managed for stock, hikers

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						and mt. bikes. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is allowed on Trail #197 but is truncated where the road section ends in section 9.
Catherine R. Brandon		584		Trail #267, Ibex to Elk Creek to 268 Trespass should be motorized. Having these trails open would provide a loop. Having more areas open to motorized traffic results in less impact on the forest because fewer people are using more areas and not just a certain few.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 from Ibex to Porcupine Cabin. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Porcupine Cabin trailhead to the Sunlight Trailhead would also allow motorcycles. Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268 or on Elk Creek Trail #195. Trespass and Elk Creek trails are being managed for mt biking, stock users and hikers to provide for non-motorized opportunities and to protect cultural resources in the high alpine basins. These two trails will still tie in with Trail #267 to provide a loop opportunity for non-motorized users. Recreation Opportunity Spectrum methodology and projected recreational use trends are discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS.
Bill Neubauer		328	Bozeman	I regard Alt 7 as an excellent representation of land management. Concerning the Trespass Trail #268 and Cottonwood Trail #197, the alternative 7 stays consistent with the current use in the area, yet it sets boundaries. On Trespass Creek there already exists ATV use, but it stops short of the sensitive alpine terrain. On Cottonwood Creek there already exists ATV use, but stops short of the lake and sensitive alpine terrain.	East Crazies	In Alternative 7 the Trespass Trail #268 and Cottonwood Trail #197 had both trails stop due to natural terrain features on Cottonwood Trail and due to private land on the Trespass Trail. To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268.User created double tracks will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes. In 7M Cottonwood Lake Trail #197 will be open to ATV and motorcycles on the roadbed into Section 9. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs due to tribal interests and cultural sites.
Ed Schmidt		1706	Bozeman	The Trespass Creek trail has historically been a rugged single-rut hiking and horse trail and has never had noticeable motorized traffic. This had been the case, that is, until 2001, when the first ATVs began pushing through this trail and into this area. Over the past 4 years, the trail has been widened to 2-track and re-routed in some areas to allow easier motorized use. The damage to Trespass Creek is recent; the area could still easily	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. Motorized routes not specifically designated for motorized uses in the travel plan decision would be prohibited under Alternatives 2 through 7M. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with these restrictions through better information, education and enforcement.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				be reclaimed to its historical un-motorized quality. I hope you will designate Trespass Creek, specifically, and all other areas that do not have a history of motorized use, as closed to motorized traffic.		Trail facilities that are not identified for non-motorized travel would likely be rehabilitated at their junction with system trails. User created double tracks that veer off the system trail will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track system trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The entire Rock Creek Trail to Rock Lake should be left open to motorcycles, especially since the north portion is already open. The very last 1/4 mile of this trail (270) is very steep and rocky, and so I opted to hike the final distance to Rock Lake. Even if motorcycles were eliminated from this short stretch of trail Rock Lake would still be well worth the short hike.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Rock Creek North Trail #270 to a natural occurring boundary in Section 10. People can then hike the remaining 1/4 mile to the lake. Motorcycles will not be allowed on Smeller Lake Trail #220 to protect cultural resources and provide for a high quality goat hunt.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The Cottonwood Lake trail should remain open to motorcycles the entire distance to the Lake. The end of this trail is rocky, but unlike the Rock Lake trail it is fairly easy to negotiate on a motorcycle. This trail (197) is also a good destination trail to Cottonwood Lake that should remain open to motorcycles.	East Crazies	In 7M Cottonwood Lake Trail #197 will be open to ATV and motorcycles on the roadbed into Section 9. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs due to tribal interests and cultural sites.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The rest of the roads that access this area should remain motorized and be guarded to insure forest access is not lost.	East Crazies	It is unclear from this comment which roads this individual is making reference to in the East Crazies. However, in 7M the roads that have provided public access to the Crazies in the past are still being managed to provide access. These are the Smith Creek Road #991, Shields Road #844, Porcupine #203, Cottonwood #250 and North Rock Road. Other roads that access the Crazies are not managed by the Gallatin National Forest and do not provide legal public access at this time. Given the growth in population, increased demands for recreation, and the increased capabilities of motorized vehicles, we believe it is now time to establish where these uses are appropriate and then provide the facilities and management controls to accommodate them. Roads that are located in the East Crazies on the Gallatin National Forest were evaluated in this travel planning process. Motorized use restrictions included in one or more of the alternatives were based on legal requirements, analyzed impacts to other resources, cost and /or an objective to provide some opportunities in a non-motorized setting. The specific reasons vary depending on the location and the alternative.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Turk Comstock		1891	Bozeman	The closing of the trail in the Crazy Mountains - Sunlight seems to be excessive. We don't have many trails open to us in those mountains and that one along with Porcupine and the Low Line trail is good mountain biking.	East Crazies	In 7M, the Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking and motorcycles will be prohibited thus providing for non-motorized opportunities and to protect cultural resources in the high alpine basins. The Shields Lowline #258, Elk Creek #195 and Trespass #268 will be managed for mountain bikes, hikers and stock. The Porcupine Lowline #267, Trail #269, #271 and the Cottonwood Lowline #272 will be managed for mountain biking.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 197 - Cottonwood Lake Trail - motorized - Summer leave open - This is a great place to explore, beautiful lake.	East Crazies	In 7M Cottonwood Lake Trail #197 will be open to ATV and motorcycles on the roadbed into Section 9. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs due to tribal interests and cultural sites.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 270 - Rock Lake Trail - Motorized - Summer leave open - this is a good place to explore, has a lake, etc.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Rock Creek North Trail #270 to a natural occurring boundary in Section 10. People can then hike the remaining 1/4 mile to the lake. Motorcycles will not be allowed on Smeller Lake Trail #220 to protect cultural resources and provide for a high quality goat hunt.
Todd Orr		840		260 - Sunlight Lake Divide - Sign and manage as closed to motorized use.	East Crazies	In 7M, the Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking, ATVs and motorcycles will be prohibited. Signs, maps and brochures will educate the public on areas open or closed to motorized use.
Todd Orr		840		270 - Rock Creek - Suggest managing as is - open to motorized travel. Terrain will prevent further extension of ATV over single track trail. Terrain will prevent motorcycle use the last mile before Rock Lake. Some trail work is needed to allow reasonable motorcycle access.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Rock Creek North Trail #270 to a natural occurring boundary in Section 10. People can then hike the remaining 1/4 mile to the lake. Motorcycles will not be allowed on Smeller Lake Trail #220 to protect cultural resources and provide for a high quality goat hunt.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Todd Orr		840		220 - Smeller Lake - Suggest managing as is - open to motorcycle travel. Some trail work is needed to allow reasonable motorcycle access.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Rock Creek North Trail #270 to a natural occurring boundary in Section 10. People can then hike the remaining 1/4 mile to the lake. Motorcycles will not be allowed on Smeller Lake Trail #220 to protect cultural resources and provide for a high quality goat hunt.
Todd Orr		840		268 - Trespass Creek - Suggest signing and managing as is - open to ATV use to the switchbacks and motorcycle use throughout. Conflicts unlikely due to low use by all others.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of road in section 9 on Trail #197.From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. Campsite inventories, ranger encounters and the National Visitor Use survey performed in 2002 would indicate that the high alpine lake basins in the Crazies receive a substantial amount of use and trends indicate that more use is occurring annually. Chapter 3 of the FEIS does include discussion on projected use trends.
Todd Orr		840		197 - Cottonwood Lake - Suggest managing as is - open to motorized use. Conflicts unlikely due to low use by others.	East Crazies	In 7M Cottonwood Lake Trail #197 will be open to ATV and motorcycles on the roadbed into Section 9. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs due to tribal interests and cultural sites. Campsite inventories, ranger encounters and the National Visitor Use survey performed in 2002 would indicate that the high alpine lake basins in the Crazies receive a substantial amount of use and trends indicate that more use is occurring annually. Chapter 3 of the FEIS does include discussion on projected use trends.
Kim Tashjian		597		The proposal is to provide trail opportunities for motorcycle and mountain bikes to Smeller Lake. This is a good idea provided there is access to the trailhead for motorcycles.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Rock Creek North Trail #270 to a natural occurring boundary in Section 10. Rock Creek Trail #270 is also being managed for mountain bikes, hikers and stock. From Section 10 to the Lake it will be managed for hikers. Motorcycles will not be allowed on Smeller Lake Trail #220 to protect cultural resources and provide for a high quality goat hunt. However, Smeller Lake Trail will be managed to accommodate mountain bikes and

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						hikers.
Kim Tashjian		597		Trail 220 is very steep so both motorcycle riders and mountain bikers would need to be expert riders to utilize bikes on this trail.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses, experiences and opportunities in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing motorcycles on Smeller Lake Trail #220 to protect cultural resources and provide for a high quality goat hunt. The Smeller Lake Trail will be managed for mountain bikes and hikers. Rock Creek North Trail #270 will allow motorcycles to a natural occurring boundary in Section 10. This trail is also being managed for hikers, mountain bikes and stock use. People can then hike the remaining 1/4 mile to the lake. To provide for a wide variety of recreation opportunities, the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum methodology and Trail Class system were used as a basis for creating the Benchmark and were also used in the effects analysis of the Recreation section of Chapter 3 of the FEIS.
Chris Alkeny		203	Bozeman	I would personally like to see the Trespass, Elk, and Cottonwood Creek trail open to motorcycles, I think the impact of motorcycles is much less the that of ATVs. This area does not have the traffic that we have in the Gallatin's and I believe that it can handle single track motorcycle use.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of road in section 9 on the Cottonwood Trail #197. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs. The Elk Creek Trail #195 will also be closed to motorcycles. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles. Campsite inventories, ranger encounters and the National Visitor Use survey performed in 2002 would indicate that the high alpine lake basins in the Crazies receive a substantial amount of use and trends indicate that more use is occurring annually. Chapter 3 of the FEIS does include discussion on projected use trends.
Dan Debar		221		The trailhead on Sunlight Creek, sec.1, T4N, R10E, should be left open to vehicle traffic. Hiking to Sunlight Lake from the present trail head is 4.2 miles. This is an 8.4 mile day hike into the lake and back to the trailhead. Removal of vehicle travel to the present trailhead would add 5 miles to this day hike making the round trip 13.4 miles. The additional	East Crazies	In 7M, the Sunlight Road #6630 is being managed as a backcountry road and will be gated during December 2nd -June 15th. The Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				miles would be through a future gravel pit, present pole cutting area and an old clear cut. Not a "real" hiking experience. The additional miles make it too long for a day hike. The snowmobile access to the area allows the use of a snowmobile to within about 3 miles of Sunlight Pass area. This is a 6 mile round trip on snowshoes or cross country skies to Sunlight Pass and back to the snowmobiles. A pleasant winter day and very doable even by us senior citizens. The draft EIS points out a need for day hike opportunities and this is one of the greatest summer day hikes and winter snowshoe trips.		although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking, ATVs and motorcycles will be prohibited. The total mileage from the trailhead to the Lake and back is 8.8 miles. There is a proposed winter parking area at milepost 0.0 of the Sunlight Road #6630. This parking area development will provide winter recreational opportunities into the Shields Loop area for snowmobiles and ski and snowshoe opportunities up the Sunlight Road #6630. The area around the Sunlight Road will be closed to snowmobiles to provide for a quiet winter experience for skiers and snowshoers. This winter parking area is dependent on federal highway dollars being allocated by Congress.
Tim Shinabarger		272	Billings	Crazy lakes trail is a similar situation. As a ranger I not only traveled these trails numerous times, but was charged with their maintenance. I believe horse users should be encouraged to stay on the trails and foot travelers to vary off their trail routes. One of the problems is the Saunders maps show off trail routes that people have started to use as trails.	East Crazies	We are not clear what the similar situation is that this individual is making reference to for the Crazy Lakes. There are a number of lakes located in the East Crazies. We encourage all users to use the system trails. User created trails can be of concern for resource damage regardless of how they were created. Proposed Objective G-1 states strive for no unclassified, undesignated roads and trails within key habitats that have been damaged or is devoid of native vegetation due to motorcycle, ATV, horse, or foot use". It is true that under the proposed travel management plan, only summer motorized uses would be restricted to designated routes. At this time the potential for impacts from off route summer motorized use on other resources is of greater concern than for non-motorized uses. New Forest maps and brochures will be developed to provide current information for system trails.
Jerry Morang		1444	Clyde Park	I have found evidence of significant usage by 4-wheelers in the Shields River drainage of the Crazy Mountains specifically in the head of Turkey Creek up and over into the American Fork Drainage. Usage has occurred on and off trails however, the trail used are not designated as such on FS maps. Please help me with understanding the law relating to this issue in this area.	General	In developing a plan for the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. The Gallatin National Forest had some areas that were open to motorized uses including the Turkey Creek area. In 7M, the ATV user created trail will not be on the Gallatin system of trails. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. Trail facilities that are not identified for non-motorized travel would likely be rehabilitated at their junction with system trails. User created double tracks that veer off the system trail will be closed and rehabilitated. Other ATV

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						loop opportunities will exist in the Shields portion of the Crazies to the North. In 7M, The Turkey Creek Road #6634 will be managed as a backcountry road and open to motorcycles and ATVs for 1.7 miles. It will be closed from September 5-June 15th for vehicles, ATVs and motorcycles. In 7m, a new summer non-motorized route would provide a means of access into the South fork from Buck Creek into the American Fork drainage. This is currently not accessible from the east side and this route serves as one means to resolve this problem. This trail would be managed for hiking and stock use.
Mary Quesenberry		769	Livingston	…road to Arasta Creek accesses mining claims owned by several Park County residents. …built and founded by Kester & Garland Counts and Kester Romans Sr. In other words, it's not even a FS road - it's private! The FS has no right whatsoever to close that road. ...property owners who have been permanently locked out of their property due to an illegal agreement between the Forest Service and adjacent land owners.	Issues	The Arrastra road #3274 is not closed to motorized use in any alternatives, including 7M.
Raquel Characklis		896	Chapel Hill NC	Leave open Sec 6 (T5N R10E) - the 1/2 mile road. This road provides a secondary exit for our family. It has already proved itself as a safety route.	Ibex	We assume that this comment is making reference to T5N, R9E, Section 6 and a road that leads out of the Smith Creek subdivision in Section 5. In 7m, this road is proposed to be open to the public as a backcountry road but is contingent upon formation of a road association being formed with landowners in Section 5 and a road use permit being issued by the Livingston Ranger District for road use and maintenance.
Sharon Eickhoff		908	Wilsall	Ibex lower trail should be open to motorized. Some money should be allocated to fence the section in question then trespassing will not occur and this can be used for access to upper Ibex.	Ibex	In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range and private lands must be respected. Efforts are being made to work with private land owners with specific concerns on specific travel routes. One purpose of the travel management plan is to provide for a broad spectrum of recreational opportunities for both motorized and non motorized uses. The focus of travel planning is on travel within the Forest. It is not a planning process for timber, fuels, livestock grazing, minerals, lands, permitted uses or other programs.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Gary Thompson		987	Belgrade	As a motorized user I am looking for loop opportunities such as North Fork Elk Creek # 195 combined w/ surrounding #271, 268, 267 and 269. Garnet Mtn trail #85 combined w/ #132 Seg 1,2,3 is great and close to home.	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of road in section 9 on the Cottonwood Trail #197. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs. The Elk Creek Trail #195 will also be closed to motorcycles. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles. In 7m Garnet mountain trail will be closed to motorized because of high foot and stock use. #132 will remain open to motorized use..
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Keep Cottonwood Lake #197 open to motorcycles. This is a good challenge and gives us access to a high mountain lake.	Ibex	In 7M Cottonwood Lake Trail #197 will be open to ATV and motorcycles on the roadbed into Section 9. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles due to tribal interests and cultural sites.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Keep the Camp Fire Lake trail open to the divide where it starts down the east side at least. There is room to turn around there and it provides a nice view of the Camp Fire Lake and drainage. Better yet reopen it all the way to Campfire Lake. The whole trail is on public land and it would be the only motorized access to the east side of the mountain.	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268.On the East side of the Crazies, Campfire Lake trail easements allow access for foot and horse travel only. In 7M, ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of road in section 9 on the Cottonwood Trail #197. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs. The Elk Creek Trail #195 will also be closed to motorcycles. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	If you intend to proclaim the last 1/2 mile into porcupine station as suitable for cars. Has the road been fixed? If not, it's too rough for most cars.	Ibex	The Porcupine Road #203 is maintained by the county where it starts at the junction of the Shields road until it reaches the Gallatin National Forest in Section 10. In 7M, Road 203 on the National Forest, in Section 10, will be managed for passenger cars from the Forest boundary to the Porcupine cabin. Efforts are made to work with the county to provide similar maintenance and management opportunities on roads that share jurisdiction. The travel plan has focused on Gallatin National Forest roads and trails that are managed by the Forest.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Loren Blanksma		36		As the east side of the Crazies are already closed so trail #197, 270 should be open all the way to the designation of Cottonwood and Rock Lakes.	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Rock Creek North Trail #270 to a natural occurring boundary in Section 10. Motorcycles will not be allowed on Smeller Lake Trail #220. ATVs are not allowed in the Rock Creek drainage. In 7M, Cottonwood Lake Trail #197 will be open to ATV and motorcycles on the roadbed into Section 9. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles due to tribal interests and cultural sites.
Loren Blanksma		36		In the West Crazies the motorized loops should remain fully intact since the East Crazies are already non-motorized.	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of road in section 9 on the Cottonwood Trail #197. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs. The Elk Creek Trail #195 will also be closed to motorcycles. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles. The Shields area will provide at least 11 motorized loop opportunities. Some of these options extend onto the Lewis and Clark National Forest.
Loren Blanksma		36		In the Ibex area, North Fork Elk Creek (195) and Trespass Creek (#268) should remain a motorized connector trail between the North Shields and the Ibex.	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of road in section 9 on the Cottonwood Trail #197. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs. The Elk Creek Trail #195 will also be closed to motorcycles. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Elk Cr. Trail #195 - Leaving this trail open would allow a looping opportunity for motorcycles. Private land easement issue - 1 land owner OK w/all users, 1 owner prefers non-motorized.	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of road in section 9 on the Cottonwood Trail #197. From this point on the trail will

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						be closed to motorcycles and ATVs. The Elk Creek Trail #195 will also be closed to motorcycles. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles. Efforts are being made to work with private land owners with specific concerns on specific travel routes.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Porcupine Cabin - This is a great family oriented cabin experience that many motorized users currently take advantage of. This area and the trails all the way to the IBEX Station are all very important to motorized families.	Ibex	We agree that the Porcupine cabin provides a family oriented experience for motorized and non-motorized trail users. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range, especially in the Porcupine and Ibex areas. Private lands must be respected. Efforts are being made to work with private land owners with specific concerns on specific travel routes.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Porcupine Cabin to Shields River Connection Trail #258 - This is an important connector trail to tie the Shields river area to the Porcupine Cabin area. Motorized families currently enjoy these trail opportunities & feel they are important to maintain in the future.	Ibex	We agree that the Porcupine cabin area provides a family oriented experience for motorized and non-motorized trail users. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range, especially in the Porcupine and Ibex areas. Private lands must be respected. Efforts are being made to work with private land owners with specific concerns on specific travel routes.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Trails #195, 267, 271, 268, 272 - These trails all tie together to create highly valuable looping experiences. These type of interconnected trails are important to motorcycle riders.	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of road in section 9 on the Cottonwood Trail #197. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs. The Elk Creek Trail #195 will also be closed to motorcycles. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles. The Shields area will provide at least 11 motorized loop opportunities. Some of these

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						options extend onto the Lewis and Clark National Forest.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Trespass Trail #208 - The proposed closure at the top is good for ATVs but motorcycles should be allowed to continue on to the ridge as they currently do. Resource issue here is ATV created and motorcycles have not contributed to this condition.	Ibex	We assume that this individual is making reference to Trespass Trail #268.To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268.On the East side of the Crazies, Campfire Lake trail easements allow access for foot and horse travel only. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of road in section 9 on the Cottonwood Trail #197.The Elk Creek Trail #195 will also be closed to motorcycles. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. Motorized routes not specifically designated for motorized uses in the travel plan decision would be prohibited under Alternatives 2 through 7. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with these restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. Trail facilities that are not identified for non-motorized travel would likely be rehabilitated at their junction with system trails. User created double tracks that veer off the system trail will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track system trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes.
Brian Sobrepena		1557		Another area I feel like is being taken away is the Ibex trail in the crazy Mountains. I've been using this trail most of my life while hunting with my dad & brother. The place we hunt is to far to walk into and getting a nice bull elk out is hard. But someone wants me and my family and our traditional hunts out of this area because we use 4-wheelers to pack in our hunting gear.	Ibex	The Ibex Trail #271 is still providing recreational opportunities for an array of users. In 7M, this trail is still being managed for motorcycle and ATVs and is open during hunting season. It will only be closed from Dec 2-June 15th. It is also open to mountain bikes, stock, hiking, snowmobiles and cross country skiers with no seasonal restrictions. There are also other ATV opportunities being provided in the Shields area of the Crazies.
Al Pendergrass		1035	Livingston	Elk Creek Trail - ATVs already up the trail. I was appalled at the damage these machines had caused. In many places that created new double tracks with the original trail neatly centered between	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Elk Creek Trail #195. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. Motorized routes not specifically designated for motorized uses in the travel plan decision would be prohibited under Alternatives 2 through 7. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with these restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. Trail facilities

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						that are not identified for non-motorized travel would likely be rehabilitated at their junction with system trails. User created double tracks that veer off the system trail will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track system trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		North fork Elk Creek Trail 195: providing easier access to fishing opportunities in Campfire and Moose Lakes. Also creates another parking access through Wilsall and relieving pressure from Clyde Park access.	Ibex	North Fork of Elk Creek Trail #197 does provide access to Campfire and Moose Lake. The other alternative access would be from the Cottonwood Trailhead which is near Clyde Park and traveling up the Trespass Trail #268.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Shields Low Line Trail 258: this trail provides access to the Shields River Area from the Porcupine Cabin. Also accesses trails 265 and 260.	Ibex	The Shields Lowline Trail #258 does provide access to South Fork of the Shields Trail #265 and the Sunlight Trail #260 from the Porcupine Trailhead.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Porcupine Low-Line Trail 267: provided access through private property remains this trail would be an excellent looping opportunity through trails 195, 267, 271, 268 from Porcupine to Ibex and back via Trespass Creek and North fork Elk Creek.	Ibex	In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range and private lands must be respected. Efforts are being made to work with private land owners with specific concerns on specific travel routes. One purpose of the travel management plan is to provide for a broad spectrum of recreational opportunities for both motorized and non motorized uses. These loop opportunities from the Porcupine Lowline #267 to connect with Elk Creek #195, Trespass #268, Ibex Trail #271 do still exist. In 7M these loops are still open to mountain biking, hikers and stock. Ibex Trail #271 is also open to motorcycles and ATVs but closed Dec.2nd to June 15th.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Trespass Trail 268 Segment two: keeping this trail opened to the ridge allows easier access to Campfire and Moose Lakes for excellence fishing opportunities and provides looping trail possibilities via trails 268, 195, 267, 271. Enforcement should be of great concern to the forest for this foolish and poorly planned closure.	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. On the East side of the Crazies, Trail #123 in the corner of Section 25 that leads down into Campfire Lake allows only foot and horse travel due to trail easements. In 7M, ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of road in section 9 on the Cottonwood Trail #197.The Elk Creek Trail #195 will also be closed to motorcycles. These trails are all open to mountain biking, hikers and stock, with the exception of mountain bikes not being allowed from the corner of Section 25 down into Campfire Lake. These motorized

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. These loop opportunities from the Porcupine Lowline #267 to connect with Elk Creek #195, Trespass #268, Ibex Trail #271 do still exist. In 7M these loops are still open to mountain biking, hikers and stock. Ibex Trail #271 is also open to motorcycles and ATVs but closed Dec.2nd to June 15th. User education and enforcement will be important in the implementation of the travel management plan, regardless of the alternative selected.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Cottonwood Low Line Trail 272: this trail crosses sections of private property but if access could be acquired it would provide an excellent connection from Ibex Station to the Rock Creek drainage.	Ibex	The Cottonwood Lowline Trail #272 is on the Gallatin National Forest system of trails. In 7M, this trail is being managed for mountain biking. Hiking and stock use will also be allowed. Mountain bikes and stock will not be allowed from April 1-June 15th. The trail is also open to snowmobiles, skiers and snowshoers.
Belle Richards		497	Helena	I am an in-holder in the Crazies. ...I have watched the gradual increase in motorized vehicles in the forest for thirty years, and am appalled at the increasing degradation of the Cottonwood Creek-Trespass Creek areas.	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of road in section 9 on the Cottonwood Trail #197. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs. The Elk Creek Trail #195 will also be closed to motorcycles. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. Motorized routes not specifically designated for motorized uses in the travel plan decision would be prohibited under Alternatives 2 through 7. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with these restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. Trail facilities that are not identified for non-motorized travel would likely be rehabilitated at their junction with system trails. User created double tracks that veer off the system trail will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track system trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes.
Bill Neubauer		328	Bozeman	I regard alternative seven as an excellent representation of land management. Concerning the Trespass Trail 268 and Cottonwood Trail 197, the alternative seven stays consistent with the current use in the area, yet it sets boundaries. On Trespass Creek there already exists ATV use, but it stopped short of the sensitive alpine terrain. On Cottonwood Creek there already exists ATV use, but stopped	Ibex	In Alternative 7M the Trespass Trail #268 and Cottonwood Trail #197 had both trails stop due to natural terrain features on Cottonwood Trail and due to resource concerns in Section 25 on the Trespass Trail. To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. User created double tracks will

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				short of the lake and sensitive alpine terrain. Something to consider is the difficulty in managing those trails which go from an ATV route to a nonmotorized or singletrack route.		be closed and rehabilitated and the single track trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes. In 7M Cottonwood Lake Trail #197 will be open to ATV and motorcycles on the roadbed into Section 9. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles and ATVs due to tribal interests and cultural sites.
Patricia Brandon		739		Southfork Shields 265 needs to be open so a loop trail can be made back to the trailhead at Porcupine trail 265.	Ibex	In Alternative 7M, the South Fork of the Shields Trail #265 is being managed for stock and hiking. Mountain biking would be allowed. This trail termini is in Section 18 on the Gallatin National Forest. There were no alternatives that proposed that new construction would take place to establish a loop opportunity by extending the termini of the trail and connecting with Elk Creek Trail #195. Section 19 is also a privately owned section.
Patricia Brandon		739		Trespass Trail #268 segment 2 trail was used until private purchase closed the trail therefore the trail should be rerouted to avoid private property.	Ibex	The Gallatin National Forest has an easement through Section 25 on Trespass Trail #268.It was never closed to the public. The trail will not be rerouted. To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268.This is due to tribal interests and cultural sites. User created double tracks will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes.
Patricia Brandon		739		Cottonwood Low Lying Trail 272 is needed to make a loop trail. Needs to be open.	Ibex	The Cottonwood Lowline Trail #272 is on the Gallatin National Forest system of trails. In 7M, this trail is being managed for mountain biking. Hiking and stock use will also be allowed. Mountain bikes and stock will not be allowed from April 1-June 15th. The trail is also open to snowmobiles, skiers and snowshoers. We are not sure what loop opportunities this individual is referring to. This trail begins on the Ibex road #2510 and the termini is where the Lowline Trail intersects Trail #270. There were no alternatives that proposed developing any loop opportunities.
Joe Polus		1487		Elk Creek Trail #195 - Leaving this trail open would allow a looping opportunity for motorcycles.	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing motorcycles or ATVs on the Elk Creek Trail #195.The trail will be open and managed for hiking, mountain biking and stock. These motorized closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Joe Polus		1487		Porcupine Cabin - This is a great family oriented cabin experience that many motorized users currently take advantage of. This area and the trails all the way to the Ibex Station are all very important to motorized families.	Ibex	We agree that the Porcupine cabin area provides a family oriented experience for motorized and non-motorized trail users. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. Other motorized opportunities will exist in the Shields portion of the Crazies where 11 motorized loop opportunities will exist. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range, especially in the Porcupine and Ibex areas. Private lands must be respected. Efforts are being made to work with private land owners with specific concerns on specific travel routes.
Joe Polus		1487		Porcupine Cabin to Shields River Connection Trail 258 - This is an important connector trail to tie the Shields river area to the Porcupine Cabin area. Motorized families currently enjoy these trail opportunities and feel they are important to maintain in the future.	Ibex	We agree that the Porcupine Cabin Trailhead provides an access route to the Shields on Trail #258. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. Other motorized opportunities will be provided in the Shields portion of the Crazies. In 7M 11 motorized loop opportunities for motorcycles and ATVs will exist. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range, especially in the Porcupine and Ibex areas. Private lands must be respected. Efforts are being made to work with private land owners with specific concerns on specific travel routes.
Joe Polus		1487		Trespass Trail #268 - The proposed closure at the top is good for ATVs but motorcycles should be allowed to continue on to the ridge as they currently do. Resource issue here is ATV created and motorcycles have not contributed to this condition.	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268.On the East side of the Crazies, Campfire Lake trail easements allow access for foot and horse travel only. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is truncated at the end of road in section 9 on the Cottonwood Trail #197.The Elk Creek Trail #195 will also be closed to motorcycles. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. Motorized routes not specifically designated for motorized uses in the travel plan decision would be prohibited under Alternatives 2 through 7M. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with these restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. Trail facilities that are not identified for non-motorized travel would likely be rehabilitated at their junction with system trails.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						User created double tracks that veer off the system trail will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track system trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes.
Richard Oksness		1639	Billings	I would like you to consider including trails #258 and #195 as part of the proposed alternative for ATV use for the west slope of the Crazies. The 258 trail allows me to gain some elevation and then I travel on foot. Trail 195 allows me to gain access to Elk Creek. I travel the Elk Creek drainage on foot.	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Elk Creek Trail #195. The Elk Creek Trail will be managed for hikers, mountain bikers and stock. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 will be open to motorcycles to the Sunlight Trailhead but closed to ATVs. The Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers and stock. This trail will also allow hikers, stock and mountain bikes. 11 loop opportunities will be available for ATVs in the Shields portion of the Crazies. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites.
Chloris Guth Zimmerman		1719	Wilsall	These comments shall pertain to lands owned by Zimmerman M Hanging Lazy 3 LLC and Henry Guth Inc on the west slope of the Crazy Mountains. These lands are in part where the FS calls the Low Land Trail. Between July 8 and 19, 2005 we had 4 wheeler trespassers leave grass knocked down, one gate thrown open, one gate placed up against a fence and one gate with the wire cut and wires wound around a nearby tree. A neighbors cattle and ours mixed together. It cost 2 haying days time to get this situation corrected. That's costly.	Ibex	We assume this comment is in reference to the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267, which has portions that pass through private lands. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. The Porcupine Lowline #267 and Shields Lowline #258 would be closed to ATVs. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range and private lands must be respected. Efforts are being made to work with private land owners with specific concerns on specific travel routes and concerns about fences and gates being left open or vandalized that exist on a trail corridor. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with these restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. These will be important components to implementing the travel plan once a decision is made. Private land owner concerns will be addressed and will be incorporated in educational user created guides, signing and ranger patrols. Trails going through private lands will be well marked and landowner issues will be addressed to keep recreationists on the established route.
Bob Soprepena		1749		Please keep the Ibex open to four wheel use during hunting season. I have never littered so much as a gum wrapper there. I have had no confrontation with	Ibex	We are not clear if this comment is for the Ibex travel planning area or for the Ibex Trail #271. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				hikers there during that time of year.		from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. The Porcupine Lowline #267 and Shields Lowline #258 would be closed to ATVs. In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is allowed on Cottonwood Trail #197 and Ibex Trail #271. The Cottonwood Trail #197 is truncated at the end of road in section 9. The Ibex Trail would be closed to motorized use from Dec 2-Jun 15th and the Cottonwood Trail would be closed October 15-June 15th. . The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range and private lands must be respected.
Loren Blanksma		1194		I do not object to closing motorized use of the Porcupine Lowline trail and consequently the connector Horse Creek Tie trail. This trail is hard to follow because it crosses so many private routes.	Ibex	In 7M, the Horse Creek Tie Trail #269 is being managed for mountain biking and hiking. Stock are also being allowed on this trail. The Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. The Porcupine Lowline #267 and Horse Creek Tie Trail #269 and Shields Lowline #258 would be closed to ATVs. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range and private lands must be respected.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The Cottonwood Lowline trail has questionable access and I could not locate this trail. This trail, if it exists, or could be upgraded, would provide a good connector route between the Ibex and Rock Lake road.	Ibex	The Cottonwood Lowline Trail #272 is on the Gallatin National Forest system of trails. In 7M, this trail is being managed for mountain biking. Hiking and stock use will also be allowed. Mountain bikes and stock will not be allowed from April 1-June 15th. The trail is also open to snowmobiles, skiers and snowshoers. This trail begins on the Ibex road #2510 and the termini is where the Lowline Trail intersects North Rock Trail #270.
Loren Blanksma		1194		I do object to closing part of the Trespass Creek trail (268) and North Fork Elk Creek trail. These trails provide a beautiful low impact single track connector loop opportunity between the North Shields and the Ibex area. Closing these trails to motorized is contrary to the stated FS goals of not isolating areas by providing connector loop opportunities wherever possible.	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Elk Creek Trail #195 or on the Trespass Trail #268. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. The Elk Creek Trail will be managed for hikers, mountain bikers and stock. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 will be open to motorcycles to the Sunlight Trailhead and but closed to ATVs. This trail does provide a connector route to the Shields where 11 other motorized loop opportunities will exist. The Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers and stock.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Loren Blanksma		1194		Also, the Ibex trail should remain open to motorcycles.	Ibex	In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is allowed on Cottonwood Trail #197 and Ibex Trail #271. The Cottonwood Trail #197 is truncated at the end of road in section 9. The Ibex Trail would be closed to motorized use from Dec 2-Jun 15th and the Cottonwood Trail would be closed October 15-June 15th.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The Shields low Line trail seems to disappear on the ridge in section 2. This trail is an ATV route and should at least remain open to where it currently exists.	Ibex	The Shields Lowline Trail #258 goes up onto the open grassy ridge in Section 2. It then drops off the ridge and intersects the South Fork of the Shields Trail #265 and continues onto the Sunlight Trailhead. There is also a user created ATV route that veers off the Shields Lowline Trail #258 and continues straight up the ridge through private property. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. The Porcupine Lowline #267 and Shields Lowline #258 would be closed to ATVs. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with these restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. Trail facilities that are not identified for non-motorized travel would likely be rehabilitated at their junction with system trails. User created double tracks that veer off the system trail will be closed and rehabilitated. Other ATV loop opportunities will exist in the Shields portion of the Crazies. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range and private lands must be respected.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The Cottonwood Creek road and Ibex road must remain motorized.	Ibex	In 7M ATV and motorcycles use is allowed on Cottonwood Trail #197 and Ibex Trail #271. The Cottonwood Trail #197 is truncated at the end of road in section 9.The Ibex Trail would be closed to motorized use from Dec 2-Jun 15th and the Cottonwood Trail would be closed October 15-June 15th.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 271 - Ibex - Motorized - Summer and Winter - Leave open - Family, fun, camping.	Ibex	The Ibex Trail #271 is still providing recreational opportunities for an array of users. In 7M, this trail is still being managed for motorcycle and ATVs and is open during hunting season. It will only be closed to ATV's and motorcycles from Dec 2-June 15th. It is also open to mountain bikes, stock, hiking, snowmobiles and cross country skiers with no seasonal restrictions.
Todd Orr		840		User-made ATV to Bald Ridge above Porcupine Cabin - Suggest managing as closed to motorized	Ibex	The Shields Lowline Trail #258 goes up onto the open grassy ridge in Section 2. It then drops off the ridge and

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				use to allow a quiet trail for foot and horse traffic in close proximity to the cabin.		intersects the South Fork of the Shields Trail #265 and continues onto the Sunlight Trailhead. There is also a user created ATV route that veers off the Shields Lowline Trail #258 and continues straight up the ridge through private property. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. The Porcupine Lowline #267 and Shields Lowline #258 would be closed to ATVs. Other quiet trail opportunities exist in the East Crazies and Ibex Travel Planning areas. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with these restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. Trail facilities that are not identified for non-motorized travel would likely be rehabilitated at their junction with system trails. User created double tracks that veer off the system trail will be closed and rehabilitated. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range and private lands must be respected.
Todd Orr		840		258 - Shields Lowline - Suggest managing as is - open to motorcycle use. These longer single track trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	Ibex	In Alternative 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. The Shields Lowline #258 from the Sunlight Trailhead to the junction of the Shields Loop Road #988 will be managed for hiking, mountain bike riding and stock.
Todd Orr		840		265 - South Fork Shields - Suggest managing as is - open to motorcycle use. These longer single track trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride. Conflicts unlikely due to low use by others.	Ibex	In Alternative 7M, the South Fork of the Shields Trail #265 is being managed for stock and hiking. Mountain biking would be allowed. This trail termini is in Section 18 on the Gallatin National Forest. Section 19 is also a privately owned section. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. This will provide a longer single track experience. The Shields Lowline #258 from the Sunlight Trailhead to the junction of the Shields Loop Road #988 will be managed for hiking, mountain bike riding and stock.
Kim Tashjian		597		The Trespass Trail (#268) is a suburb trail for ATVs, motorcycles, and mountain bikes and snowmobiles. Even average riders would be able to enjoy the ride up the trail. In addition, I feel the Lowline trail (#267)	Ibex	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. In 7M the Trespass Trail #268

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				is also an excellent trail to enjoy these activities on. It is not steep for the most part, unlike most trails in the Crazies, so would give non-expert riders a safe trail to relax and enjoy the ride on.		is being managed for hiking, mountain biking and stock. In the winter, Trespass trail is open to snowmobiles and skiers. ATV and motorcycles are allowed on the Cottonwood Trail #197 and Ibex Trail #271. On Cottonwood, ATV and motorcycle use is truncated at the end of the road in section 9. From this point on the trail will be open to hikers, mountain bikes and stock. The entire trail will also be open to snowmobiles and skiers. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. The Porcupine Lowline #267 and Shields Lowline #258 would be closed to ATVs. In the winter the Lowline trails would be ski routes and closed to snowmobiles. These closures are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. In 7M, 11 other ATV loop opportunities would exist in the Shields that would accommodate all skill level of ATV riders.
Patricia Brandon		739	Bozeman	South Fork Shields #265 needs to be open so a loop trail can be made back to trailhead in Porcupine Trail#265. Trespass Trail #268 Analysis: Issues (General) Seq. 2 trail was used until private purchase closed trail therefore the trail should be rerouted to avoid private property. Cottonwood Lowline Trail #272 is needed to make loop trail. Needs to be open.	Ibex	In Alternative 7M, the South Fork of the Shields Trail #265 is being managed for stock and hiking. Mountain biking would be allowed. This trail termini is in Section 18 on the Gallatin National Forest. There were no alternatives that proposed that new construction would take place to establish a loop opportunity by extending the termini of the trail and connecting with Elk Creek Trail #195. Section 19 is also a privately owned section. In Alternative 7M the Trespass Trail #268 and Cottonwood Trail #197 had both trails stop due to natural terrain features on Cottonwood Trail and due to resource concerns in Section 25 on the Trespass Trail. The Gallatin National Forest has an easement through Section 25 on Trespass Trail #268. It was never closed to the public. The trail will not be rerouted. To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing ATVs or motorcycles on the Trespass Trail #268. User created double tracks will be closed and rehabilitated and the single track trail will be managed for stock, hikers and mt. bikes. The Cottonwood Lowline Trail #272 is on the Gallatin National Forest system of trails. In 7M, this trail is being managed for mountain biking. Hiking and stock use will also be allowed. Mountain bikes and stock will not be allowed from April

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						1-June 15th. The trail is also open to snowmobiles, skiers and snowshoers. This trail begins on the Ibex road #2510 and the termini is where the Lowline Trail intersects North Rock Trail #270.
Patricia Dowd		1261		The FS proposal for Trail 3274 is troubling. In alt 7, the FS proposed to open the trail to motorcycle and ATV use and build a connector trail to Emigrant Peak and Trail 3272. I believe this area is inappropriate for motorcycles and ATVs due to the areas steep and rocky terrain.	Mill Creek	The Arrastra to Emigrant Gulch motorized connector trail in alternative 7M, is in place on existing roads except for approximately 1 mile of connector trail to be constructed. The construction of the connector trail will require additional site-specific environmental analysis. At that time the impacts of constructing a trail to standard will be evaluated.
Jim Earl		1264		Emigrant Gulch - we would like to see this area closed to off-road snowmobile traffic to protect the powder snow resource in this area. There is very little skiable steeper backcountry ski terrain southwest of Mill Creek between Passage Creek and the West Fork of Mill Creek. Further west, however, the Chico Peak area and Emigrant Peak area provide very good terrain and climate for backcountry skiers.	Mill Creek	The slopes of Emigrant Creek to Emigrant Road #3272 are open to snowmobiles in alternatives 1-7. Alternative 7M expands the Emigrant Peak snowmobile closure north to (but not including) the Emigrant Creek Road #3272. This expansion provides for a quiet backcountry skiing opportunity on the northern slopes south of road #3272.
Jim Earl		1264		ORV loop that would connect Arrastra Creek with upper Emigrant Gulch. This is a bad place to try to achieve a loop opportunity because it would require construction of an expensive road, and increase the traffic on non FS roads.	Mill Creek	The Arrastra to Emigrant Gulch motorized connector trail in alternative 7M, is in place on existing roads except for approximately 1 mile of connector trail to be constructed. The construction of the connector trail will require additional site-specific environmental analysis. At that time the impacts and cost of constructing a trail to standard will be evaluated.
Jann Holter Berntsen		1884	Livingston	I would like to give my input against making Old Chico/Emigrant Gulch a designated ATV recreation destination. Increased traffic of ATVs will make the whole area less desirable to all who are enjoying it as it is now. I also fear increased risk of fire in the area. That is a great concern as it does become very dry in late summer.	Mill Creek	The Arrastra to Emigrant Gulch motorized connector trail in alternative 7M, is in place on existing roads except for approximately 1 mile of connector trail to be constructed. The construction of the connector trail will require additional site-specific environmental analysis. At that time the impacts and cost of constructing a trail to standard will be evaluated.
Heather Rigler		846		I am writing this letter concerning the funneling of ATV traffic to Emigrant Creek. Increased traffic on this one lane road would be dangerous as the road is primitive, the heavy riparian foliage, blind corners, and the many people from Chico Hot Springs who use it as a hiking trail.	Mill Creek	The Arrastra to Emigrant Gulch motorized connector trail in alternative 7M, is in place on existing roads except for approximately 1 mile of connector trail to be constructed. The construction of the connector trail will require additional site-specific environmental analysis. At that time the impacts and cost of constructing a trail to standard will be evaluated.
Pat Thums		862	Livingston	I would like to see snowmobiles use limited to Emigrant Gulch road as opposed to allowing	Mill Creek	The slopes of Emigrant Creek to Emigrant Road #3272 are open to snowmobiles in alternatives 1-7. Alternative

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				snowmobiles up into the bowl area. This is a great backcountry skiing area for people in Livingston. I have seen very little snowmobile use up there and a restriction could keep it that way. Moving that proposed boundary to the "culvert" would provide somewhat of safeguard for this backcountry ski area.		7M expands the Emigrant Peak snowmobile closure north to (but not including) the Emigrant Creek Road #3272. This expansion provides for a quiet backcountry skiing opportunity on the northern slopes south of road #3272.
Todd Orr		840		58 - Passage Creek - Suggest managing as closed to motorized use to reduce conflicts with non-motorized users.	Mill Creek	The Passage Creek trail #59 is open to summer motorized use in alternatives 1, 2 and 3, and closed to this use in alternatives 4, 5, 6, 7 and 7M. Motorized vehicles are prohibited to eliminate conflicts between non-motorized and motorized users, and to reduce impacts on riparian areas and fish habitat.
Todd Orr		840		275 - Colley Creek - Suggest managing as closed to motorized use to reduce conflicts with non-motorized users.	Mill Creek	The Colley Creek Trail #275 is open to motorized users in alternatives 1 and 2, and closed to motorized users in alternatives 3-7, and 7M. The trail enters the Absaroka-Beartooth wilderness approximately 1 mile from the trailhead. Motorized use is prohibited to eliminate incursions into the wilderness.
Todd Orr		840		78 - Wicked Ridge - Suggest trail maintenance and managing as open to motorcycle loop back to Snowbank campground. This area has no single-track motorcycle trails available.	Mill Creek	The Wicked Ridge trail #78 is open to motorcycles in alternatives 1 and 2 and closed in alternatives in 4-7, and 7M. Motorcycles are prohibited because the West Fork of Mill Creek road provides access to the same area, and to avoid intrusions into the Absaroka-Beartooth wilderness.
Todd Orr		840		65 - Emigrant - Suggest managing as is - open to motorized use - Suggest managing as closed to ATV use where trail crosses creek and follows riparian area in southeast corner of section 7. Closure signs and Wilderness signs are needed.	Mill Creek	Because of an error in the Detailed Description of the Alternatives (Chapter II-247) route tables, the Emigrant Trail #65 is not displayed. However, the trail is displayed on the alternative maps, including alternative 7M. In alternatives 1-7, trail #65 is open to ATVs and motorcycles. In alternative 7M, motorized uses are prohibited to eliminate intrusions into the Absaroka-Beartooth wilderness, and on the North Fork Six Mile trail #606.
Todd Orr		840		69 - East Fork Mill 3280/Snowy Range Ranch - Suggest managing as is - open to motorcycles to maintain the only loop ride in the area from Mill Creek road 486 to East Fork Mill road 3280. Sign and manage trails 51 and 54 as closed to motorized use due to Wilderness access. User conflicts would be minimal due to low use by all.	Mill Creek	The Highland (Jomaha) trails #54 and #69 are open to ATV and motorcycles in alternative 1, open to motorcycles in alternatives 2 and 3, and closed to summer motorized uses in alternatives 4, 5, 6, 7 and 7M. Alternative 7M prohibits motorized use to eliminate motorized intrusions into the Absaroka-Beartooth wilderness. The East Fork of Mill Creek Trail # 51 is open to ATVs and motorcycles in alternative 1 and open to motorcycles in alternative 2. This trail is closed to motorized uses in alternatives 3-7, and 7M, to eliminate

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						the potential for illegal incursions into the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness.
Todd Orr		840		54 - 69 Dam Creek access - suggest managing as closed to motorized use to reduce conflicts with non-motorized users.	Mill Creek	The Highland (Jomaha) trails #54 and #69 are open to ATV and motorcycles in alternative 1, open to motorcycles in alternatives 2 and 3, and closed to summer motorized uses in alternatives 4, 5, 6, 7 and 7M. Alternative 7M prohibits motorized use to eliminate motorized intrusions into the Absaroka-Beartooth wilderness.
Bryan Wells		783	Pray	I am concerned that the closure of ATV areas and naming Emigrant Gulch as a designated ATV trail, too much traffic will be funneled to Emigrant Creek.	Mill Creek	The motorized use on the Arrastra-Emigrant motorized route will be monitored to determine impacts on road and trail facilities, and social values. If unacceptable impacts that cannot be mitigated are occurring then, the Forest Service can modify the Travel plan to address unacceptable impacts.
Sharon Boyes		793	British Columbia	Over the years the Forest Service has never had a need to traverse our property. Hence we have never requested/nor been granted an easement to our property. One idea that we might consider is the granting of an easement in exchange for a modest cabin site lower down on one of the Mill Creeks. Further, by exchanging the designation of these roads, the Forest Service would be denying us reasonable access to our property. For East Crazies Travel Planning Area some years we have been able to access our claims with 4-wheel drive vehicles. Considering the above information, I trust that the FS will withdraw their plans to: 1. put a connector between Arasta Creek Road (3274) and Emigrant Gulch and, 2. Restrict High Clearance Vehicles on the Arasta Creek Road.	Mill Creek	The granting of easements and land adjustments are outside of the scope of the Travel Plan decision. Alternative 7M includes the Emigrant-Arrastra route to provide a high elevation, motorized opportunity.
John Franks		813		…the Franks and Counts families and their heirs have enjoyed the use (and participated in the maintenance of) Passage Creek Trail No. 58 for nearly one hundred years. We have always encouraged the use of this trail for public enjoyment and access to Passage Creek Falls as well. We depend on the use of motorized access via the trail to HES 865 particularly when hazardous road conditions have forced the Forest Service to close and the only road access we have. During winter and early spring when the roads are muddy and soft and not open yet, motorized travel via this trail is our only	Mill Creek	The Passage Creek trail #59 is open to summer motorized use in alternatives 1, 2 and 3, and closed to this use in alternatives 4, 5, 6, 7 and 7M. Property owners with land in the Passage Creek inholding have reasonable access to their private property by a private road authorized under special-use permit to the Passage Creek Road User's Association.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				access. If this access were eliminated, the amount of time we are able to enjoy our property would be limited to 5 or 6 months a year.		
Craig Kenworthy		826	Bozeman	In the Mill Creek Area- the proposed Arasta-Emigrant Connector trail should not be built. The trail goes over steep terrain at a high elevation. The potential damage to natural resources is too great. In addition, this trail could lead to a large increase in ATV and motorcycle traffic on Emigrant Creek Road, since visitors will have to park down the road and ride up to reach the trail.	Mill Creek	The Arrastra to Emigrant Gulch motorized connector trail in alternative 7M, is in place on existing roads except for approximately 1 mile of connector trail to be constructed. The construction of the connector trail will require additional site-specific environmental analysis. At that time the impacts and cost of constructing a trail to standard will be evaluated.
Erik Guss		575		I support closing this area to off-trail snowmobiling. Emigrant and Chico peaks are used for backcountry skiing but not so much for snowmobiling, except for road access.	Mill Creek	The slopes of Emigrant Creek to Emigrant Road #3272 are open to snowmobiles in alternatives 1-7. Alternative 7M expands the Emigrant Peak snowmobile closure north to (but not including) the Emigrant Creek Road #3272. This expansion provides for a quiet backcountry skiing opportunity on the northern slopes south of road #3272.
Todd Orr		840		Deep Creek Trail - Suggest signing and managing as closed to motorized use.	Mission Creek	The South Fork of Deep Creek trail #388 is open to ATVs and motorcycles in alternatives 1 and 2. Motorized use is prohibited on this trail in alternatives 3-7, and 7M. The trail enters the wilderness approximately 1 mile from the Absaroka-beartooth Wilderness. Motorized use is prohibited on the trail in alternative 7M to avoid the risk of illegal motorized incursions in the wilderness.
Ursula Neese		1455	Livingston	Elephant Head Peak - This climb is one that I enjoy each year. The trail head is well established, very functional and should not be changed.	Mission Creek	Alternative 7 proposed moving the trailhead north to Bruffie Lane, a County Road. The proposal to move the trailhead is based on a need to provide a more visable trailhead thus reducing illegal activities. Furthermore moving the trailhead would allow for horse trailer parking and a winter recreation parking area. In alternative 7M, the parking area would be retained in its current location because of public concerns over adverse interactions between the private landowner and the public, and due to a lack of support from Park Co. the jurisdictional authority on a majority of the road.
Steve Caldwell		618		Thank you for your proposal to close Suce Creek road to snowmobile use as snowmobile and other vehicle use negates the route's value as a ski trail.	Mission Creek	Your comment is noted in the record.
Jane Gentholts		916	Bozeman	I disagree w/ some of the Big Creek area proposed closures: these trails are lightly impacted by mtn bikes and should remain accessible to bikers. Keep the Gallatin Crest trail open to mtn bikes. It is an	Mountain Bikes	The Big Creek side trail # 196, #159, 225, and #181are within the HPBH WSA. The Forest Service Manual (2300) direction for WSAs requires that the travel plan maintain the area's potential for future wilderness

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				extreme trail but magnificent for a hardcore ride.		designation and maintain wilderness character as it existed in 1977. These trails are not open to motorcycles or mountain bikes in Alternative 7M to maintain the wilderness character of the WSA.
Paul Tunkis		782	Livingston	178 Trail. I would urge that this trail remain open from the trailhead to its junction with trail 167. This short trail/road provides vital access to the large basin to the north of the junction of the two trails for hunters hunting moose in the fall and bear in the spring. Though the trail is short it provides nearly a 400 foot elevation gain over areas that are steeper and rougher than the map can indicate. I can attest from personal experience that this can make a profound difference for moose hunters as I killed a moose in this area a few years ago. Without ATV access it would have been extremely difficult to remove the carcass in a timely manner due to the heat of late September that year. Blocking the 178 trail near its junction with the 167 trail to ATV use would be no more difficult than closing it at the trailhead. The trail/road is steep and narrow in many places near the junction and a barrier would be just as effective there as anywhere since this is a remote and seldom used area of the forest. Both trails beyond the junction are marginal for ATV use anyway. The 167 trail becomes impassible to even experienced riders within a mile of the junction. The 178 trail becomes marginal and somewhat dangerous after passing through the meadow section to the southwest of the trail junction.	Porcupine Buffalo-Horn	The Rock Creek South trail #178 and Meadows trail #167 are open to motorized use ATVs and/or motorcycles) in alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 4. These trail are closed to all motorized uses in alternatives 5, 6 and 7. In alternative 7M, trails #167 and #178 are closed to motorcycles to improve secure habitat for grizzly bears (FEIS Chapter 3, Issue 10: Grizzly Bear).
Loren Blanksma		1194		Rock Creek trail (178) would also provide a more roundabout connector route between Windy Pass and Ramshorn Lake. If Rock Creek trail (178) is closed to motorcycles, I suggest that you consider opening Big Creek trail (180) in conjunction with Windy Pass trail (177) to provide a feeder route for motorcycles from the Yellowstone side.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The Rock Creek trails (#177, #180, #167 and #178) and portion of the Gallatin Crest Trail #96 are closed to motorcycles to improve secure habitat for grizzly bears (FEIS Chapter 3, Issue 10: Grizzly Bear). The Big Creek Trail was closed to motorized use in 1962 because of safety concerns for motorcycle and horseback users. This public health issue still exists, therefore prohibiting motorcycle use in Big Creek is maintained in Alternative 7M.
Todd Orr		840		179 - Rock Creek- Suggest signing and closing to ATV use to prevent further ATV trail extension on a single track trail. Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use. These longer single track trails are	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The Rock Creek South trail #178 and Meadows trail #167 are open to motorized use ATVs and/or motorcycles) in alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 4. These trail are closed to all motorized uses in alternatives 5, 6 and 7. In

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.		alternative 7M, trails #167 and #178 are closed to motorcycles to improve secure habitat for grizzly bears (FEIS Chapter 3, Issue 10: Grizzly Bear).
Todd Orr		840		167 - Rock to Big Creek - Suggest signing and closing to ATV use to prevent further ATV trail extension on a single track trail. Manage as is for motorcycle use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The Rock Creek trails (#177, #180, #167 and #178) and portion of the Gallatin Crest Trail #96 are closed to motorcycles to improve secure habitat for grizzly bears (FEIS Chapter 3, Issue 10: Grizzly Bear). The Big Creek Trail was closed to motorized use in 1962 because of safety concerns for motorcycle and horseback users. This safety issue still exists, therefore prohibiting motorcycle use in Big Creek is maintained in Alternative 7M.
Todd Orr		840		Lower Rock Creek Trail in Section 34 - Sign and manage as closed to motorized use to prevent riparian damage along stream.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The Rock Creek trails (#177, #180, #167 and #178) and portion of the Gallatin Crest Trail #96 are closed to motorcycles to improve secure habitat for grizzly bears (FEIS Chapter 3, Issue 10: Grizzly Bear). The Big Creek Trail was closed to motorized use in 1962 because of safety concerns for motorcycle and horseback users. This public health issue still exists, therefore prohibiting motorcycle use in Big Creek is maintained in Alternative 7M.
Todd Orr		840		96 - Crest from 180 to 178/299 - Manage as is for motorcycle use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Alternative 7M retains the motorcycle prohibition on portion of the Gallatin Crest Trail #96 to improve secure habitat for grizzly bears (FEIS Chapter 3, Issue 10: Grizzly Bear).
Joe Lawellin		13	Livingston	Maintaining access to numbered trails and old numbered trails. In the Crazy Mountains there is a trail from Duck Creek to the head of the Shields river. It runs the length of the west side of the Crazy Mountains and has not been cleaned for years.	Shields	We assume that this comment is in regards to Buck Creek which is located up in the Shields Travel Planning Area. Duck Creek is located way in the Southern portion of the range and does not connect with the head of the Shields River. The trail that is being referenced is not on the Gallatin system of trails and has not been maintained. In 7M, this user created trail (or old trail) will not be on the Gallatin system of trails. The Buck Creek Road #6631 will be managed for project use and public motorized use will be restricted. It will be open to mountain bikes, stock and hiking. This road ends near the ridge that heads northeast towards the headwaters of the Shields.The user created trail will be closed due to tribal interests and cultural sites. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. Trail facilities that are not identified for non-motorized travel would likely be rehabilitated at their junction with

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						system trails. User created double tracks that veer off the system trail will be closed and rehabilitated. Other ATV loop opportunities will exist in the Shields portion of the Crazies to the North.
Sharon Eickhoff	Citizens for Balanced Use	908	Wilsall	Bennett Creek loop, a designated snowmobile area, should remain open. Turkey Creek: Currently a good trail for summer and winter travel; won't require any maintenance. Fawn & Lodgepole Creek: both good existing trails; offer great recreational access. Buck Creek: reopen this existing trail; great sightseeing opportunities & no maintenance required. Sunlight Creek: reopen this area for hunting, snowmobiling & ATV use; should be extended to meet w/ the Porcupine area. Virginia Peak: proposed trail #639 is a great choice & will access L&C NF; will provide access to Forest Lake trail #642/635 or #638. Bald Ridge Road: only a culvert is required to make this useable. East Fk Smith Creek Road: 1/2 mile of FS road that is primary access for homeowners and an escape route in case of fires.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. We assume that this comment is in reference to the Shields Loop Road. There is not a Bennett Creek loop in the Shields Planning area. In 7M, the Shields Loop Road Segment 2,3, and 4 will be managed as a groomed snowmobile trail. The majority of area around the loop road is open to snowmobiles except for an area closure to snowmobiles in the South Fork Shields and Sunlight drainages. This closure is in favor of providing a segregated, quiet cross country skiing opportunity. In 7M, The Turkey Creek Road #6634 will be managed as a backcountry road and open to motorcycles and ATVs for 1.7 miles. It will be closed from September 5-June 15th for vehicles, ATVs and motorcycles but open to snowmobiles. Lodgepole Trail #266 is being managed for stock and hiking with mountain biking being prohibited. This was to provide consistency with the Lewis and Clark National Forest. Snowmobiling and skiing will be accepted. Fawn Creek is not on the Gallatin system of trails. The roads in the Fawn Creek area are being managed for project use where public motorized use is prohibited. This area is open to snowmobiles in the winter. Motorized closures in the Fawn Creek drainage are due to tribal interests and cultural sites. In 7M, the user created Buck Creek Trail(or old trail) will not be on the Gallatin system of trails. The Buck Creek Road #6631 will be managed for project use and public motorized use will be restricted. It will be open to mountain bikes, stock and hiking. This road ends near the ridge that heads northeast towards the headwaters of the Shields.The user created trail will be closed due to tribal interests and cultural sites. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. Trail facilities that are not identified for non-motorized travel would likely be rehabilitated at their junction with system trails. User created double tracks

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						that veer off the system trail will be closed and rehabilitated. Other ATV loop opportunities will exist in the Shields portion of the Crazies to the North. In 7m, a new summer non-motorized route would provide a means of access into the South fork of the American Fork drainage. This would begin near the junction of Buck Creek and the Shields Loop Road. This area is currently not accessible from the east side and this route serves as one means to resolve this problem. This trail would be managed for hiking and stock use. In 7M, the Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking and motorcycles will be prohibited. The Shields Lowline #258 will be open to motorcycles from the Porcupine cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead. From Sunlight Trailhead towards Bennett Creek Trailhead, the trail will be managed for mountain bikes, hikers and stock. The Shields Lowline #258 would have an area closure to snowmobiles in favor of providing a segregated, quiet cross country skiing opportunity. The majority of the Shields loop and a portion of the Ibex area provides a significant amount of open space snowmobile opportunities. In 7M, Honey Run Trail #130 Seg 1 will intersect with Trail #645 on the Lewis and Clark and for a long loop opportunity. This will be managed for ATVs and motorcycles. The Bald Ridge Road is not on the Forest system of roads. However, we believe this comment is making reference to the system of roads in Section 33. The upper roads are being managed for project use and are closed to public motorized use to protect wildlife habitat. The lower section of roads in Section 33 provides a short ATV and motorcycle loop. We assume that this comment is making reference to T5N,R9E, Section 6 and a road that leads out of the Smith Creek subdivision in Section 5. In 7m, this road is proposed to be open to the public as a backcountry road but is contingent upon formation of a road association being formed with landowners in Section 5 and a road use permit being issued by the Livingston Ranger District for road use and maintenance.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jesse Hemmingsen		925	Livingston	Smith Creek: creating new trails and improving existing trails on Forest Service property in an area of several private residences is going to cause nothing but conflict between FS user and private property owner. Open road from Sec 6 to Sec 5 to give residents in Sec 5 two ways out of property in case of fire w/ little or no improvements to road. We are avid 4-wheelers and have witnessed damage done to trails from motorcycles which tear up trails multiple times more than 4-wheelers and we feel motorcycles should be restricted in a lot of areas. Bitter Creek: we feel this trail is adequate as is and feel no extension needs to be done to help wildlife in that location. Keep Bald Ridge road closed to all motorized use; at times this is a highly populated area for elk. Trail #258 from Sunlight to Porcupine cabin needs to open to ATVs and snowmobile use; it's the only trail that connects Smith Creek, the Shields to Ibex or Cottonwood area.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, the existing and proposed trails in Smith Creek are on National Forest and not on private lands. Efforts have been made to work with private land owners in the travel planning process. We assume that this comment is making reference to T5N,R9E, Section 6 and a road that leads out of the Smith Creek subdivision in Section 5. In 7m, this road is proposed to be open to the public as a backcountry road but is contingent upon formation of a road association being formed with landowners in Section 5 and a road use permit being issued by the Livingston Ranger District for road use and maintenance. In 7M, most of the trails in the Shields are being managed for motorcycle and ATV use. There are 11 loop opportunities. Some loops are on existing roads. Some loops will be managed for project use as well as ATVs and motorcycles. Some of the other loops will have portions of roads that have dual use for ATV's, motorcycles and vehicles. Goat Creek Trails, Honey Run #130 Seg 1 and the long loop to Forest Lake will be closed to vehicles and managed for ATVs and motorcycles. This comment was not specific enough to address damage from motorcycles. In 7M, Bitter Creek Road #6637 will be managed for backcountry road use by vehicles and encourages ATV and motorcycles. Bitter Creek Road also provides access to three motorized loops. The Bald Ridge Road is not on the Forest system of roads. However, we believe this comment is making reference to the system of roads in Section 33. The upper roads are being managed for project use and are closed to public motorized use to protect wildlife habitat. The lower section of roads in Section 33 provides a short ATV and motorcycle loop. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. The Porcupine Lowline #267 and Shields Lowline #258 would be closed to ATVs. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range and private lands must be respected. Efforts are being made to work with private land owners with specific concerns on specific travel routes and on the types of use that

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						they are willing to accommodate. The Shields Lowline #258 would have an area closure to snowmobiles in favor of providing a segregated, quiet cross country skiing opportunity. The majority of the Shields loop and a portion of the Ibex area provides a significant amount of open space snowmobile opportunities.
Steve Kroon		941	Bozeman	A trail proposed from the Shields to the American Fork. This linking an area proposed for heavy ATV use to an area w/ wilderness characteristics.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7m, a new summer non-motorized route would provide a means of access into the South fork of the American Fork drainage. This is currently not accessible from the east side and this route serves as one means to resolve this problem. This trail would be managed for hiking and stock use.
Gary and Lana Richards		966	Billings	Keep existing Smith Creek Road #991 open as a secondary route out of our cabin which is located above the road. Keeping the existing road will prevent people from creating alternate routes and thus keep the existing area from being abused by alternate off road travel.	Shields	In 7m, the Smith Creek Road #991 Seg 1(which goes from Shields River road to the south line of section 31) is not gated and is being managed as a primary passenger car access to Forest lands within the Smith Creek area. It also provides access to private lands and is proposed to be nominated as a Public Forest Service Road.
Charles Fritz		1012	Billings	Smith Creek: We found 4-wheeler tracks on many of the abandoned logging roads and then found they had explored well beyond the logged areas going deep into forested areas, meadows, crossing seeps and accessing ridge lines. A very notable example is a track that climbs up the headwaters of Smith Creek through fragile areas arriving on the top of Baldy Mtn.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. Arguments advocating and opposing OHV use of the Forest have constituted a large number of comments received. We believe that providing opportunities for ATV travel is appropriate and therefore it was a use accommodated in each of the seven alternatives. See Chapter III of the Detailed Descriptions of the Preferred Alternative for more information. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. Trail facilities that are not identified for non-motorized travel would likely be rehabilitated at their junction with system trails. User created double tracks that veer off the system trail will be closed and rehabilitated. Eleven ATV loop opportunities will exist in the Shields portion of the Crazies. Many of these loops will use existing roads and those that are not a designated route for ATVs and motorcycles will be managed for project use but closed to public motorized use. The headwaters of Smith Creek in section 29 and 30 will not be open to public motorized

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						use due to tribal interests, cultural sites and consistency on travel management with the Lewis and Clark National Forest. Rationale is stated in III-22.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	The Sunlight trail #273 should be open to motorcycles. The trail is impassible to anything but foot traffic about 3/4 mile from the divide on the west side. It make is possible to get to Sunlight Lake to fish and back in one day.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, the Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking and motorcycles will be prohibited. The Shields Lowline #258 will be open to motorcycles from the Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead. User education and enforcement will be important in the implementation of the travel plan, regardless of the alternative selected. Rationale is stated in Chapter III-22.
John Perdaems		76	Bozeman	Northern Crazy Mountains area and the Shields River Loop Road. For years now my family and I have enjoyed ATV driving on the loop road. It is the perfect place for families. When my children were 3 and 4 we would rent the Bennet Creek Cabin and slowly putt around the whole loop, stopping to fish the upper Shields in the summer and hunt in the fall. Please leave it open for ATV use.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, the Shields Loop Road #844 is divided into 4 segments. The first segment is open to ATVs with no restrictions yearlong and Segment 2,3,4 are open to ATVs except from Dec 2-June 15th. Segment 3 has dual designation for road and trail uses. This is from Lodgepole Trailhead to Shields Campground. Segment 1,2 and 4 will accept ATV traffic but are being managed for passenger cars and backcountry vehicles.
Dave Laubach		1095		For the past 15 years I have trapped and hunted mountain lions and bobcats by snowmobile in the Elk Creek Canyon and near the Porcupine Ranger Station. I also have snowmobiled at the upper Shields. By restricting trail use will severely jeopardize my livelihood.	Shields	In developing the Shields and Ibex travel planning areas, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. Alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by not allowing snowmobiles on the Elk Creek Trail #195. Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 or on the Shields Lowline Trail #258. In winter, the Shields Lowline Trail #258 and Porcupine Lowline #267 will be managed as a marked ski/snowshoe route and have an area closure for snowmobiles. This is to provide a segregated quiet cross country skiing/snowshoe experience. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range, especially in the Porcupine and Ibex areas. Private lands must be respected. Efforts are being made to work with

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						private land owners with specific concerns on specific travel routes. In 7M, the Shields Loop Road Segment 2,3, and 4 will be managed as a groomed snowmobile trail. The majority of area around the loop road is open to snowmobiles except for an area closure to snowmobiles in the South Fork Shields and Sunlight drainages. This closure is in favor of providing a segregated, quiet cross country skiing opportunity. The Trespass, Rapid Creek and Cottonwood Creek areas will also be open to snowmobiles. Hunting and trapping are still a viable option in Elk Creek but it will have to be done on snowshoes or skiis. The expanded social economic analysis discusses the implications of travel planning in more detail.
Danielle Nicholas		1105	Bozeman	Please do not allow ORVs on the Shield's River side of the Crazy Mountains. As the daughter of a rancher in this area, we have had significant trouble with ORV riders on forest grazing leases. Also, we have a numerous incidents of trespass on private land as a result of ORVs on public lands.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range and private lands must be respected. Efforts are being made to work with private land owners with specific concerns on specific travel routes and concerns about fences and gates being left open or vandalized that exist on a trail corridor. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with these restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. These will be important components to implementing the travel plan once a decision is made. Private land owner concerns will be addressed and will be incorporated in educational user created guides, signing and ranger patrols. Trails going through private lands will be well marked and landowner issues will be addressed to keep recreationists on the established route. Management of the National Forest involves directing many different programs and activities. It is not possible to address numerous proposals or recommendations in one single analysis effort. In general, we must select or identify proposals for analysis and decision that are based on problems, needs, or opportunities that we believe are a priority and are also ripe for decision. This planning process focuses on travel within the Forest. It is not the planning process for timber harvest, fuels management, livestock grazing, mineral extraction, permitted uses or other programs.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jay O'Neill		1109		Bennett Creek: I have ridden here all of my life. Most of the skiers I know ride a snowmobile into this area to ski.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, the Bennett Creek area and Shields Loop road are open to snowmobiles and skiers. There is an area closure near Deep Creek and Sunlight Creek to provide a segregated quiet cross country skiing opportunity.
George D. Targee		1579	Idaho	This refers to a short 1/2 mile road that connects to existing Smith Creek Road (Section 6, T5N/R9E) which is Forest Rt #991, to the private section 5. During a major fire in Sept 1994 the FS opened this road to provide a second escape route for the firefighters, should it become necessary. The same requirement is there today for the residents. This short route would provide the only alternative escape route for several families if our primary road becomes blocked by fire. We are not requesting the FS to provide funding or maintenance for this road - only that you allow it to remain open. As a group, we will ensure that it remains passable.	Shields	We assume that this comment is making reference to T5N,R9E, Section 6 and a road that leads out of the Smith Creek subdivision in Section 5. In 7m, this road is proposed to be open to the public as a backcountry road but is contingent upon formation of a road association being formed with landowners in Section 5 and a road use permit being issued by the Livingston Ranger District for road use and maintenance.
Janet Hartman		1317	Wilsall	From existing Smith Creek road (991) a one half mile road provides a secondary fire escape route to section 5 landowners. Is ingress for firefighters. Leave open and locals have agreed to maintain.	Shields	We assume that this comment is making reference to T5N,R9E, Section 6 and a road that leads out of the Smith Creek subdivision in Section 5. In 7m, this road is proposed to be open to the public as a backcountry road but is contingent upon formation of a road association being formed with landowners in Section 5 and a road use permit being issued by the Livingston Ranger District for road use and maintenance.
Janet Hartman		1317		Existing (closed) trail and road from section 6 (TE 5 N/R10 E) through section 31/32 connects with existing and proposed forest service trail/road. If you do this it presents one more quote loop quote instead of dead in.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, an effort has been made to provide 11 motorized loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area. There is a loop that uses existing roads that will take off out of Section 6 and goes into Section 31 and loops back. There is also an option from Section 31 to go on a longer loop that goes into Section 32 and back into Section 31 and then Section 6. This route will be managed for project use and motorcycle and ATV use. Public motorized use will be limited to trail vehicles.
Janet Hartman		1317		You can save money by not opening in new/proposed trail from section 33 through section 4 (T5 N/are 10 E.). This would be unnecessary and	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				expensive.		7M, an effort has been made to provide 11 motorized loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area. In 7M, the proposed connector route from section 33 through section 4 has been dropped in an effort to preserve elk habitat.
Janet Hartman		1317		"open area" of Bennett Creek loop access to the Sunlight Creek area trail from section 26 should be left open and connect as a loop through section 36 and 30. Many of us like to ride to Sunlight on ATVs and then hike in further. The distance from Bennett Creek to the trail and then further is not doable for seniors.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, The Shields Loop Road Seg. 2 is being managed for passenger cars and is being nominated as a Public Forest Service Road. This is open to all vehicles, ATVs and motorcycles with a closure from Dec 2nd to Jun 15th. This road is also a groomed snowmobile route. The Sunlight Road #6630 is being managed as a backcountry road to the Sunlight Trailhead. This is also open to vehicles, ATVs and motorcycles from Dec 2-Jun15th. This will be closed to snowmobiles on a yearlong basis to provide a quiet skiing opportunity in the winter. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Sunlight Trailhead to the Bennett Creek Trailhead is being managed for mt biking, hiking and stock. It will be closed to ATVs and motorcycles. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from Sunlight towards the Porcupine Cabin is being managed for motorcycles. ATV's will be prohibited. This trail is also open to mt bikes, hikers and stock. The road that leads South from the Sunlight Trailhead is being managed for project use and will be prohibited for public motorized use. In 7M, there are 11 other ATV loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area.
Janet Hartman		1317		Access to the South Fork of the American Fork in Miners Creek is in area many ride in. This is reachable from groomed Bennett Creek Loop. Please leave open sections 26, 27, 34, 35, 36 and 1, 2, 3.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. We assume that this comment is making reference to winter opportunities off of the groomed snowmobile route on the Shields Loop Road. In 7M, the South Fork of the American Fork and Miners Creek has an area closure yearlong to snowmobiles except on designated routes. Section 26,27,34,35,36,and 1,2,3 are in this closure. Snowmobile closures are related to lack of suitable public access from the East side of the Crazies and cultural integrity and tribal concerns.
Janet Hartman		1317		Closing sections 26, 35, 2 and 1 and allowing only cross-country skiing is not right. In all the years of	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				riding snowmobiles there have been only a few skiers.		west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, The Shields Loop Road will still be a groomed snowmobile route. There are no area closures on the Loop Road except for the portions of the road that go through private property. Snowmobiles must stay on the existing roadbed through private lands. There are also snowmobile opportunities in the Cottonwood, Rapid Creek and Trespass drainages in the Ibex and East Crazies Travel Planning Area. The Sunlight Road #6630 will be closed to snowmobiles on a yearlong basis to provide a quiet skiing opportunity in the winter. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Sunlight Trailhead to the Porcupine Station is a marked cross country and snowshoe trail. It also will be closed yearlong to snowmobiles. The area closure does include Sections 26, 35,2, and 1 as well as other Sections. In 7M, an effort has been made to provide a segregated quiet cross country skiing opportunity. An effort was also made in the Ibex Travel Planning area to not allow snowmobiles with an area closure due to checkerboard land ownership patterns, poor snow quality and to protect critical big game winter range.
Patricia Kamrath		284	Wilsall	The open area of Bennett Creek loop access to Sunlight should be left open and made as a loop. This loop would be of great recreational value to those who are handicapped or elderly by using ATVs.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, The Shields Loop Road Seg. 2 is being managed for passenger cars and is being nominated as a Public Forest Service Road. This is open to all vehicles, ATVs and motorcycles with a closure from Dec 2nd to Jun 15th. This road is also a groomed snowmobile route. The Sunlight Road #6630 is being managed as a backcountry road to the Sunlight Trailhead. This is also open to vehicles, ATVs and motorcycles from Dec 2-Jun15th. This will be closed to snowmobiles on a yearlong basis to provide a quiet skiing opportunity in the winter. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Sunlight Trailhead to the Bennett Creek Trailhead is being managed for mt biking, hiking and stock. It will be closed to ATVs and motorcycles. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from Sunlight towards the Porcupine Cabin is being managed for motorcycles. ATV's will be prohibited. This trail is also open to mt bikes, hikers and stock. The road that leads South from the Sunlight Trailhead is

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						being managed for project use and will be prohibited for public motorized use. In 7M, there are 11 other ATV loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area.
Claudia Alt		317	Livingston	section 6 (Township 5 North/Range 10 East) from existing Smith Creek Road 991 a one half mile Road provides a secondary fire escape route to section 5 landowners. It is also ingress for firefighters. Leave open and locals will maintain.	Shields	We assume that this comment is making reference to T5N,R9E, Section 6 and a road that leads out of the Smith Creek subdivision in Section 5. In 7m, this road is proposed to be open to the public as a backcountry road but is contingent upon formation of a road association being formed with landowners in Section 5 and a road use permit being issued by the Livingston Ranger District for road use and maintenance.
Claudia Alt		317		Existing (closed) trail/road from section 6 (Township 5 North/Range 10 East) through section 31 and 32 connects with existing and proposed forest service trail/road. If you do this it presents one more loop instead of a dead end.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, an effort has been made to provide 11 motorized loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area. There is a loop that uses existing roads that will take off out of Section 6 and goes into Section 31 and loops back. There is also an option from Section 31 to go on a longer loop that goes into Section 32 and back into Section 31 and then Section 6. This route will be managed for project use and motorcycle and ATV use. Public motorized use will be limited to trail vehicles.
Claudia Alt		317		Trail 130 (Township 6 North/Range 10 East) should also be left open to present another loop in section 33 or 34. This could connect 638 and or 642, 635 in the Lewis and Clark (these trails exist). You can save money by not opening new/proposed trail from section 33 through section 4 (Township 5 North/Range 10 East). This would be expensive and unnecessary.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, an effort has been made to provide 11 motorized loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area. In 7M, the Honey Run Trail #130 Segment 1 will be managed for ATV and motorcycles. It will have a closure on Sept 5-June 15th to motorcycles and ATVs for bow hunting opportunities. This trail meets Trail #645 on the Lewis and Clark and provides a long loop opportunity that goes to Forrest Lake where two options exist to come back on the Gallatin National Forest near Lodgepole Creek. Segment 2 and Segment 3 of the Honey Run Trail #130 will be closed to ATVs, motorcycles and mountain bikes and is being managed for hiking and stock use. Trails #635, #642, #638 and #645 on the Lewis and Clark will be open to ATV and motorcycles but will have date restrictions in the fall. In 7M, the proposed connector route from section 33 through section 4 has been dropped in an effort to preserve elk habitat. Rationale is

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						stated in Chapter III-22.
Claudia Alt		317		"Open Area" of the Bennett Creek loop access to the Sunlight Creek area trail from section 26 should be left open and connect as a loop through section 36 and 30. Many of us like to ride to Sunlight on ATVs and then hike in further. The distance from Bennett Creek to the trail and then further is not "doable" for seniors.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, The Shields Loop Road Seg. 2 is being managed for passenger cars and is being nominated as a Public Forest Service Road. This is open to all vehicles, ATVs and motorcycles with a closure from Dec 2nd to Jun 15th. This road is also a groomed snowmobile route. The Sunlight Road #6630 is being managed as a backcountry road to the Sunlight Trailhead. This is also open to vehicles, ATVs and motorcycles from Dec 2-Jun15th. ATV riders can ride to the Trailhead and then hike to Sunlight Lake. The Sunlight Road will be closed to snowmobiles on a yearlong basis to provide a quiet skiing opportunity in the winter. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Sunlight Trailhead to the Bennett Creek Trailhead is being managed for mountain biking, hiking and stock. It will be closed to ATVs and motorcycles. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from Sunlight towards the Porcupine Cabin is being managed for motorcycles. ATV's will be prohibited. This trail is also open to mt bikes, hikers and stock. The road that leads South from the Sunlight Trailhead is being managed for project use and will be prohibited for all public motorized use. In 7M, there are 11 other ATV loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area.
Claudia Alt		317		Thank you for attempting to create a wonderful "Forest Lake" loop with Lewis and Clark forest from the East Fork area.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, an effort has been made to provide 11 motorized loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area. One of main loops goes up the first section of the Honey Run Trail #130 where it meets Trail #645 on the Lewis and Clark National Forest and then goes to Forrest Lake and back onto the Gallatin National Forest near Lodgepole Creek. This is being managed for motorcycle and ATV use.
Claudia Alt		317		Access to the South Fork of the American Fork in Miners Creek is an area many ride in. This is reachable from groomed Bennett Creek Loop. Please leave open sections 26, 27, 34, 35, 36 and 1,	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the West side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. We assume that this comment is making reference to winter

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				2, 3. This need is being addressed by Livingston and Big Timber Rangers.		opportunities off of the groomed snowmobile route on the Shields Loop Road. In 7M, the South Fork of the American Fork and Miners Creek has an area closure yearlong to snowmobiles except on designated routes. Section 26,27,34,35,36,and 1,2,3 are in this closure. Snowmobile closures are related to lack of suitable public access from the East side of the Crazies and due to cultural integrity and tribal concerns.
Claudia Alt		317		From Bennett Creek area: closing section 26, 35, 2, 1 and allowing only cross country skiing is wrong. In years of riding snowmobiles there I have only ever seen one skier. This also ties into comments in (a) above.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the West side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, The Shields Loop Road will still be a groomed snowmobile route. There are no area closures on the Loop Road except for the portions of the road that go through private property. Snowmobiles must stay on the existing roadbed through private lands. There are also snowmobile opportunities in the Cottonwood, Rapid Creek and Trespass drainages in the Ibex and East Crazies Travel Planning Area. The Sunlight Road #6630 will be closed to snowmobiles on a yearlong basis to provide a quiet skiing opportunity in the winter. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Sunlight Trailhead to the Porcupine Station is a marked cross country and snowshoe trail. It also will be closed yearlong to snowmobiles. The area closure does include Sections 26, 35,2, and 1 as well as other Sections. In 7M, an effort has been made to provide a segregated quiet cross country skiing opportunity. An effort was also made in the Ibex Travel Planning area to not allow snowmobiles with an area closure due to checkerboard land ownership patterns, poor snow quality and to protect critical big game winter range.
Patricia Kamrath		284	Wilsall	The open area of Bennett Creek loop access to Sunlight should be left open and made as a loop. This loop would be of great recreational value to those who are handicapped or elderly by using ATVs.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, The Shields Loop Road Seg. 2 is being managed for passenger cars and is being nominated as a Public Forest Service Road. This is open to all vehicles, ATVs and motorcycles with a closure from Dec 2nd to Jun 15th. This road is also a groomed snowmobile route. The Sunlight Road #6630 is being managed as a backcountry road to the Sunlight Trailhead. This is also open to vehicles, ATVs and motorcycles from Dec 2-

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Jun15th. This will be closed to snowmobiles on a yearlong basis to provide a quiet skiing opportunity in the winter. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Sunlight Trailhead to the Bennett Creek Trailhead is being managed for mt biking, hiking and stock. It will be closed to ATVs and motorcycles. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from Sunlight towards the Porcupine Cabin is being managed for motorcycles. ATV's will be prohibited. This trail is also open to mt bikes, hikers and stock. The road that leads South from the Sunlight Trailhead is being managed for project use and will be prohibited for public motorized use. In 7M, there are 11 other ATV loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area.
Patricia Brandon		739		Shields Low Lying 197: Historical use by motorcycles, personally used it since 1967. It is an important part of the riding in the Upper Shields, it needs to remain open.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. We assume that this comment is in reference to the Trail #258, the Shields Lowline or maybe the Porcupine Lowline #267. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. Trail #258 from Sunlight Trailhead to the Bennett Creek Trailhead will be closed to motorcycles and managed for hiking, mt biking and stock. Other motorized opportunities will be provided in the Shields portion of the Crazies. The rationale is stated in Chapter III-22. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range, especially in the Porcupine and Ibex areas. Private lands must be respected. Efforts are being made to work with private land owners with specific concerns on specific travel routes.
Calvin and Mary Sarver		634		Calvin has always used the Sunlight trail to go into Sunlight Lake. He uses a motor bike on the lower part. The plan will not allow that usage any more. The plan also abandons the Highline, Lowline and Deep Creek trails that would alleviate the pressure on the Sunlight trail. To replace almost all the closed trails, the travel plan proposes the establishment of a new trail that would involve getting access from land owners who may or may not be willing to give the easements.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the West side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, the Sunlight Road #6630 is being managed as a backcountry road to the Sunlight Trailhead. This is also open to vehicles, ATVs and motorcycles from Dec 2-Jun15th. The Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking and motorcycles will be prohibited. The Shields Lowline #258 will be open to motorcycles from the Sunlight Trailhead to the Porcupine cabin. It will also be open to mountain bikes, hikers and stock. ATVs will be prohibited. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Sunlight Trailhead to the Bennett Creek Trailhead is being managed for mountain biking, hiking and stock. It will be closed to ATVs and motorcycles. This trail is also open to mt bikes, hikers and stock. The road that leads South from the Sunlight Trailhead is being managed for project use and will be prohibited for public motorized use. In 7M, there are 11 other ATV and motorcycle loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area. The trail on Deep Creek is not on the system of trails. It will be managed for project use and closed to public motorized use. We are unclear where the Highline Trail is and which new trail this is individual is making reference to in the comment.
Catherine R. Brandon		584		In Smith Creek, we would like to see a loop from East Fork Smith Creek to Forest Lake and back on trail 130. This would give motorized traffic another place to go.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the West side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole .In 7M, an effort has been made to provide 11 motorized loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area. In 7M, the Honey Run Trail #130 Segment 1 will be managed for ATV and motorcycles. It will have a closure on Sept 5-June 15th to motorcycles and ATVs for bow hunting opportunities. This trail meets Trail #645 on the Lewis and Clark and provides a long loop opportunity that goes to Forrest Lake where two options exist to come back on the Gallatin National Forest near Lodgepole Creek. These trails then meets Road #6635 East Fork Smith Creek Road, which is being managed as a backcountry road and will have dual designation for vehicles, ATVs and motorcycles. Segment 2 and Segment 3 of the Honey Run Trail #130 will be closed to ATV, motorcycles and mountain bikes and is being managed for hiking and stock use. Trails #635, #642, #638 and #645 on the Lewis and Clark will be open to ATV and motorcycles but will have date restrictions in the fall.
Patricia Kamrath		284	Wilsall	The open area of Bennett Creek Loop access to Sunlight should be left open and made as a loop. This loop would be of great recreational value to	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the West side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				those who are handicapped or elderly by using ATVs.		7M, The Shields Loop Road Seg. 2 is being managed for passenger cars and is being nominated as a Public Forest Service Road. This is open to all vehicles, ATVs and motorcycles with a closure from Dec 2nd to Jun 15th. This road is also a groomed snowmobile route. The Sunlight Road #6630 is being managed as a backcountry road to the Sunlight Trailhead. This is also open to vehicles, ATVs and motorcycles from Dec 2-Jun15th. This will be closed to snowmobiles on a yearlong basis to provide a quiet skiing opportunity in the winter. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Sunlight Trailhead to the Bennett Creek Trailhead is being managed for mountain biking, hiking and stock. It will be closed to ATVs and motorcycles. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from Sunlight towards the Porcupine Cabin is being managed for motorcycles. ATV's will be prohibited. This trail is also open to mt bikes, hikers and stock. The road that leads South from the Sunlight Trailhead is being managed for project use and will be prohibited for public motorized use. In 7M, there are 11 other ATV loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area.
Henry Rashjian		1708	Wilsall	There is no viable reason to close Sunlight Road because other than my wife and her friends, I saw one person snowshoeing on that road all last winter. There are also lots of old roads in the area that have been Kelly Humped that could be used for the purpose of non-motorized use. Actually, you see very few people up there on snowmobiles, usually old folks and people with kids.	Shields	In 7M, the Sunlight Road #6630 is being managed as a backcountry road and allows all vehicles to the trailhead during the summer and fall months. The road will be gated during December 2nd -June 15th. The Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight Lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking, ATVs and motorcycles will be prohibited. The total mileage from the trailhead to the Lake and back is 8.8 miles. There is a proposed winter parking area at milepost 0.0 of the Sunlight Road #6630. This parking area development will provide winter recreational opportunities into the Shields Loop area for snowmobiles and ski and snowshoe opportunities up the Sunlight Road #6630. The area around the Sunlight Road will be closed to snowmobiles to provide for a quiet winter experience for skiers and snowshoers. This winter parking area is dependent on federal highway dollars being allocated by

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Congress.
Loren Blanksma		1194		Since the area is remote and very lightly used, there should be no legitimate reason to close any current motorized routes. Thus, I object to these closures (Buck Creek road, Crandall Creek Road, Lodgepole Creek trail, Honey-run Trail). The Honey Run trail crosses in and out of the Lewis and Clark National Forest, which is fully accessible to ATVs, and so I see no reason to close this trail to motorized as it is a good ATV opportunity.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the West side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, an effort has been made to provide 11 motorized loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area. The Lodgepole Trail #266 is being managed for stock and hiking with mountain biking being prohibited. This was to provide consistency with the Lewis and Clark National Forest. Snowmobiling and skiing will be accepted. In 7M, the user created Buck Creek Trail(or old trail) will not be on the Gallatin system of trails. The Buck Creek Road #6631 will be managed for project use and public motorized use will be restricted. It will be open to mountain bikes, stock and hiking. This road ends near the ridge that heads northeast towards the headwaters of the Shields.The user created trail will be closed due to tribal interests and cultural sites. It is the goal of the Forest Service to gain compliance with restrictions through better information, education and enforcement. Trail facilities that are not identified for non-motorized travel would likely be rehabilitated at their junction with system trails. User created double tracks that veer off the system trail will be closed and rehabilitated. The Crandall Creek Road #66 is also being managed for project use and public motorized use will be restricted. It will be open to mountain bikes, stock and hiking. Other ATV loop opportunities will exist in the Shields portion of the Crazies to the North. In 7M, the Honey Run Trail #130 Segment 1 will be managed for ATV and motorcycles. It will have a closure on Sept 5-June 15th to motorcycles and ATVs for bow hunting opportunities and to be consistent with the Lewis and Clark National Forest restrictions. This trail meets Trail #645 on the Lewis and Clark and provides a long loop opportunity that goes to Forrest Lake where two options exist to come back on the Gallatin National Forest near Lodgepole Creek. Segment 2 and Segment 3 of the Honey Run Trail #130 will be closed to ATV, motorcycles and mountain bikes and is being managed for hiking and stock use. Trails #635, #642, #638 and #645 on the Lewis and Clark will be open to ATV and motorcycles

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						but will have date restrictions in the fall. In 7M, the proposed connector route from section 33 through section 4 has been dropped in an effort to preserve elk habitat.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The uninventoried routes (Scab Rock trail 261, 262) should remain open to motorized.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the West side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. Scab Rock #261 and Lower Scab Rock #262 have been inventoried and are on the Gallatin National Forest system of trails. In 7M,these trails are being managed for motorcycles and ATV use.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The remaining road system should all remain open to motorized use.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the West side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. A Forest wide roads analysis has been completed for the Gallatin National Forest. In 7M, there are many roads in the Shields that will be open to vehicles as well as ATVs, motorcycles and snowmobiles. There are some roads that will be closed and managed for project use. Many of the roads that are closed to motorized uses are closed due to resource concerns related to sedimentation and fish and wildlife habitat. This comment is not specific enough to give specific rationale.
Dan DeBar		1251		The Lodgepole Creek connection in the s1/2, sec. 12 T5N R10E is totally unnecessary. The upper Shields is presently connected via Lodge Pole Creek to the Forest Lake Road with an existing trail. This in turn connects to trail #130 therefore making a connection to the Smith Creek Road. This loop is complete at this time with no new trail connections.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the West side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, an effort has been made to provide 11 motorized loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area. In 7M, the Honey Run Trail #130 Segment 1 will be managed for ATV and motorcycles. It will have a closure on Sept 5-June 15th to motorcycles and ATVs for bow hunting opportunities and to be consistent with the Lewis and Clark National Forest restrictions. This trail meets Trail #645 on the Lewis and Clark and provides a long loop opportunity that goes to Forrest Lake where two options exist to come back on the Gallatin National Forest near Lodgepole Creek. The connection in the S1/2 of Section 12 provides another motorized option as well as the existing connector route via Lodge Pole Creek which then connects with the Smith Creek Road. Segment 2 and Segment 3 of the Honey Run Trail #130 will be closed to ATV, motorcycles and mountain bikes and is being managed for hiking and stock use. Trails #635,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						#642, #638 and #645 on the Lewis and Clark will be open to ATV and motorcycles but will have date restrictions in the fall. In 7M, the proposed connector route from section 33 through section 4 has been dropped in an effort to preserve elk habitat.
Dan DeBar		1251		The second totally unnecessary new trail connects Bitter Creek with the East Fork Smith Creek Road. This is prime summer habitat for elk and other wildlife. This area is presently trailless and with some old logging only on the last 1/2 mile on the north side of the East Fork of Smith Creek Road. There is no real "beauty spots" such as lakes or fishable streams. There is no logical reason for a trail in this area.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the West side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, an effort has been made to provide 11 motorized loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area. In 7M, the proposed connector route from section 33 through section 4 has been dropped in an effort to preserve elk habitat. Rationale is stated in Chapter III-22.
Dan DeBar		1251		The trailhead on Sunlight Creek should be left open to vehicle traffic. This is an 8.4 mile hike into the lake and back and removal of vehicle travel to the present trailhead would add 5 miles. The additional miles would be through a future gravel pit, present pole cutting area, and an old clear cut. Not a real hiking experience.	Shields	In Alternative 7M, the Sunlight Road #6630 is being managed as a backcountry road and allows all vehicles to the trailhead during the summer and fall months. It will be gated during December 2nd -June 15th. The Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight Lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking, ATVs and motorcycles will be prohibited. The total mileage from the trailhead to the Lake and back is 8.8 miles. There is a proposed winter parking area at milepost 0.0 of the Sunlight Road #6630. This parking area development will provide winter recreational opportunities into the Shields Loop area for snowmobiles and ski and snowshoe opportunities up the Sunlight Road #6630. The area around the Sunlight Road will be closed to snowmobiles to provide for a quiet winter experience for skiers and snowshoers. This winter parking area is dependent on federal highway dollars being allocated by Congress.
Dan DeBar		1251		The Shields Low Line trail from Porcupine Ranger Station should be improved and marked for snowmobile use. From the present trail 258 there are many places accessible to day trips. Leave this trail accessible to over the snow vehicles, OHVs and motorcycles.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the West side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 and Shields Lowline #258 from Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead will be open to motorcycles, mountain bikes, hikers, and stock. The Shields Lowline #258 from

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Sunlight Trailhead to the Bennett Creek Trailhead will be managed for hikers, mt bikes and stock. This portion will be closed to motorcycles. Trail #258 will be closed to ATVs. Other summer motorized loop opportunities will be provided in the Shields portion of the Crazies. In winter, the Shields Lowline Trail #258 and Porcupine Lowline #267 will be managed as a marked ski/snowshoe routes and have an area closure for snowmobiles. This is to provide a segregated quiet cross country skiing/snowshoe experience. The Crazies do have checkerboard ownership throughout the range, especially in the Porcupine and Ibex areas. Private lands must be respected and have been acknowledged. Efforts are being made to work with private land owners with specific concerns on specific travel routes. An effort was also made in the Ibex Travel Planning area to not allow snowmobiles with an area closure due to checkerboard land ownership patterns, poor snow quality and to protect critical big game winter range. In 7M, The Shields Loop Road will still be a groomed snowmobile route. There are no area closures on the Loop Road except for the portions of the road that go through private property. Snowmobiles must stay on the existing roadbed through private lands. There are also snowmobile opportunities in the Cottonwood, Rapid Creek and Trespass drainages in the Ibex and East Crazies Travel Planning Area. The Sunlight Road #6630 will be closed to snowmobiles on a yearlong basis to provide a quiet skiing opportunity in the winter.
Larry M. Tobin		863		The upper Gallatin trail known as the Bitter Creek trail begins on Smith Creek Road and dead ends a mile or so below trail 130. If they were connected, OHV users would have less excuse to create their own trails.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, an effort has been made to provide 11 motorized loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area. In 7M, there are roads in Section 29 and Section 33 that head North off of the Bitter Creek Road ##6637. There is a road in the SE Section of 29 that is being managed for project use and motorcycle and ATVs. This road does not connect with Honey Run Trail #130. There are also a portion of the roads in Section 33 that will also be managed for project use and motorcycles and ATVs but these are short loops and head South not connecting with Honey Run #130. The proposed connector route

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						from section 33 through section 4 has been dropped in an effort to preserve elk habitat. In 7M, the Honey Run Trail #130 Segment 1 will be managed for ATV and motorcycles. It will have a closure on Sept 5-June 15th to motorcycles and ATVs for bow hunting opportunities and to meet similar restrictions from the Lewis and Clark National Forest. This trail meets Trail #645 on the Lewis and Clark and provides a long loop opportunity that goes to Forrest Lake where two options exist to come back on the Gallatin National Forest near Lodgepole Creek. Segment 2 and Segment 3 of the Honey Run Trail #130 will be closed to ATV, motorcycles and mountain bikes and is being managed for hiking and stock use.
Dan Debar		221		I am most familiar with the northern Shields portion of the Gallatin National Forest. I have property in the Smith Creek cabin sites. The first and foremost objection to the different alternatives is the building of a new trails to make loops and connections. The Lodge Pole Creek connection in the S1/2, sec.12, T5N, R10E is totally unnecessary. The upper Shields is presently connected via Lodge Pole Creek to the Forest Lake Road with an existing trail. This in turn connects to trail #130 therefore making a connection to the Smith Creek Road. This loop is complete at this time with no new trail connections.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the West side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, an effort has been made to provide 11 motorized loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area. In 7M, the Honey Run Trail #130 Segment 1 will be managed for ATV and motorcycles. It will have a closure on Sept 5-June 15th to motorcycles and ATVs for bow hunting opportunities and to be consistent with the Lewis and Clark National Forest restrictions. This trail meets Trail #645 on the Lewis and Clark and provides a long loop opportunity that goes to Forrest Lake where two options exist to come back on the Gallatin National Forest near Lodgepole Creek. The connection in the S1/2 of Section 12 provides another motorized option as well as the existing connector route via Lodge Pole Creek which then connects with the Smith Creek Road. Segment 2 and Segment 3 of the Honey Run Trail #130 will be closed to ATV, motorcycles and mountain bikes and is being managed for hiking and stock use. Trails #635, #642, #638 and #645 on the Lewis and Clark will be open to ATV and motorcycles but will have date restrictions in the fall. In 7M, the proposed connector route from section 33 through section 4 has been dropped in an effort to preserve elk habitat.
Dan Debar		221		The Shields Loop Road should be left in its present status. I am a day hiker, snowshoer, cross country skier and snowmobiler.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the West side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, the Shields Loop road is open to snowmobiles, snowshoers, skiers and hikers. There is an area closure

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						near Deep Creek and Sunlight Creek to provide a segregated quiet cross country skiing opportunity. .
Dan Debar		221		The Shields Low Line Trail from Porcupine Ranger Station to the Buck Creek, Fawn Creek area should be improved and marked for snowmobile use. From the Present trail #258 there are many places accessible to day trips. These include the South Fork of the Shields Trail #265, Sunlight Lake Trail #260 and the new Fawn Creek connection for a great ski or snowshoe over the top to places like American Fork and Sunlight Lake. Leave this trail accessible to over the snow vehicles, OHVs and motorcycles.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the West side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. In 7M, The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Sunlight Trailhead to the Bennett Creek Trailhead is being managed for mountain biking, hiking and stock. It will be closed to ATVs and motorcycles. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from Sunlight towards the Porcupine Cabin is being managed for motorcycles. ATV's will be prohibited. This trail is also open to mt bikes, hikers and stock. There is an area closure for snowmobiles from the Porcupine Cabin to the Sunlight Trailhead and just past this trailhead to Deep Creek. The Sunlight Road #6630 will also be closed to snowmobiles on a yearlong basis to provide a segregated quiet skiing opportunity in the winter. In 7M, The Shields Loop Road will still be a groomed snowmobile route. There are no area closures on the Loop Road except for the portions of the road that go through private property. Snowmobiles must stay on the existing roadbed through private lands. There are also snowmobile opportunities in the Cottonwood, Rapid Creek and Trespass drainages in the Ibex and East Crazies Travel Planning Area. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Sunlight Trailhead to the Porcupine Station is a marked cross country and snowshoe trail. An effort was also made in the Ibex Travel Planning area to not allow snowmobiles with an area closure due to checkerboard land ownership patterns, poor snow quality and to protect critical big game winter range. In 7M, there are 11 other ATV loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area.
Paul Bradley		227		I would like to see Sunlight Creek trail closed to Atvs/all motorized traffic at the current trailhead. Sept 5 - June 15.	Shields	In 7M, the Sunlight Road #6630 is being managed as a backcountry road and will be gated during December 2nd -June 15th. The Sunlight Lake Trail #260 is not being divided into two segments. It is being managed to encourage hiking from the trailhead to Sunlight lake. Hikers can easily hike into the lake and back out in an afternoon. Stock use will be accepted on the entire trail although the natural terrain features may limit some users. Mountain biking, ATVs and motorcycles will be prohibited. The total mileage from the trailhead to the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Lake and back is 8.8 miles. There is a proposed winter parking area at milepost 0.0 of the Sunlight Road #6630. This parking area development will provide winter recreational opportunities into the Shields Loop area for snowmobiles and ski and snowshoe opportunities up the Sunlight Road #6630. The area around the Sunlight Road will be closed to snowmobiles to provide for a quiet winter experience for skiers and snowshoers. This winter parking area is dependent on federal highway dollars being allocated by Congress.
Patricia Brandon		739	Bozeman	Shields Low Line #1West Bridger South Travel Planning Area. Historical use by motorcycles, personally used since 1West Bridger North Travel Planning Area7. It is an important part of the riding in the upper shields, it needs to remain open.	Shields	In developing the Shields travel planning area, an effort was made to provide a balance of opportunities on the west side of the Crazy Mountain Range as a whole. We assume that this comment is being made for the Shields Lowline Trail #258 in the Shields Planning Area. In 7M, The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Sunlight Trailhead to the Bennett Creek Trailhead is being managed for mt biking, hiking and stock. It will be closed to ATVs and motorcycles. The Shields Lowline Trail #258 from Sunlight towards the Porcupine Cabin is being managed for motorcycles. ATV's will be prohibited. This trail is also open to mt bikes, hikers and stock. In 7M, there are 11 other ATV and motorcycle loop opportunities in the Shields Planning Area.
Jennifer Woods		786	Boise, ID	…request the road in Section 6 (T5N R10E) at Smith Creek be left open. …having this 2nd escape route is vital to the safety of all of us who live and play in this area.	Shields	We assume that this comment is making reference to T5N,R9E, Section 6 and a road that leads out of the Smith Creek subdivision in Section 5. In 7m, this road is proposed to be open to the public as a backcountry road but is contingent upon formation of a road association being formed with landowners in Section 5 and a road use permit being issued by the Livingston Ranger District for road use and maintenance
Greg Beardslee		737		Fridley lakes and Creek: I propose that the Gallatin Forest take the lead and create a contour trail from Hyalite Creek north to Trail Creek, carefully skirting around the private sections, to allow people access to this part of the forest. This trail could provide an ongoing lesson for the public in fire recovery.	Yellowstone	We are aware of the difficult access situation in the Fridley Creek area. As discussed in Chapter I of the Detailed Description of the Alternatives, Alternatives 2 through 7-M include an objective to obtain better access to this area. This would allow use of the existing trail network and avoid construction of new trails.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	The West pine trail should be open to motorcycles. It was partially built by motorcycle users. I was one.	Yellowstone	The West Pine trail # 139 is within the HPBH WSA, and motorized use was not included in Alternative 7M to separate motorized and non-motorized uses and maintain the wilderness character of the WSA.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Trail # 183 from Big Creek trail head to Stoughten Creek road should be reopened to motorcycles use. The Stoughten Creek road also should be open. The only reason it is closed is because the outfitters bitched. They don't own it and don't deserve exclusive use.	Yellowstone	Access across private lands was acquired on the Donahue trail #183 in the early 1990s. As part of the negotiations to acquire public access, motorized uses were prohibited. A decision to renegotiate the easement is outside of the scope of the Travel Plan.
Dale Sexton		1127		Either Bark Cabin or Lewis Creek should remain open to mountain bikes. These seldom traveled trails (by any means) provide a unique experience that can be equaled nowhere else.	Yellowstone	The Big Creek side trail # 196, #159, , 225, and #181are within the HPBH WSA. The Forest Service Manual (2300) direction for WSAs requires that the travel plan maintain the area's potential for future wilderness designation and maintain wilderness character as it existed in 1977. These trails are not open to motorcycles or mountain bikes in Alternative 7M to maintain the wilderness character of the WSA.
Marlene Renwyck		496	Livingston	While the map says that Big Creek is not open to motorized use, we have witnessed snowmobile tracks on the trail on more than one occasion, most likely coming from cabin renters.	Yellowstone	Big Creek Trail #180 and the surrounding area are closed to snowmobiles in alternative 7 and 7M
Greg Beardslee		737		Big Creek Side Trails: I am having problems with the banning of mountain bikes from this area of the Gallatin's north of Big Creek. The Livingston Ranger District claims that because of the wilderness study area status and the lack of an apparent history of motorcycle use in the area this part of the forest should be closed mountain bikers. There is a motorcycling history in this area and I am working to uncover some of it. Wing when there is not a mountain bike problem here, never has been, and never will be in our lifetimes. There is no trail damage caused by bikers. So I implore the Gallatin Forest Management to not create a closure issue where no issue well ever logically exist.	Yellowstone	The Big Creek side trail # 196, #159, , 225, and #181are within the HPBH WSA. The Forest Service Manual (2300) direction for WSAs requires that the travel plan maintain the area's potential for future wilderness designation and maintain wilderness character as it existed in 1977. These trails are not open to motorcycles or mountain bikes in Alternative 7M to maintain the wilderness character of the WSA.
Jenny McCune	Gallatin Valley Bicycle Club	762		Big Creek-keep open for mountain bikers. These include the Bark Cabin Trail #159, the Lewis Creek Trail #181, and the Cliff Creek Trail #225. Mountain bikers do not damage these trails anymore than hikers and I believe our presence would not be in conflict with Judge Molloy's edict that this area be kept in a wilderness state circa 1977. I believe our quiet recreation and low impact makes us appropriate users for these trails. The trails are challenging which would keep the number of riders low, so I believe for these reasons these trail should	Yellowstone	The Big Creek side trail # 196, #159, , 225, and #181are within the HPBH WSA. The Forest Service Manual (2300) direction for WSAs requires that the travel plan maintain the area's potential for future wilderness designation and maintain wilderness character as it existed in 1977. These trails are not open to motorcycles or mountain bikes in Alternative 7M to maintain the wilderness character of the WSA. The Big Creek trail #180 is open mountain bikes in Alternatives 7 and 7M to provide for some mountain biking opportunities in the HPBH. This trail has a recent (since 1977) history of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				remain open to us.		mountain bike use and is popular with these users, therefore, Alt 7m maintains the trail as open to mountain bikes.
David Molebash	Montana Ranch Company	677		Big Creek Road (#2500) and trails. The proposed closure to winter travel in this drainage may adversely affect outfitters operating in the drainage. I am opposed to any closure that might interfere with their business and would ask that this area be left open to public use in the winter.	Yellowstone	Alternative 7M retains the area snowmobile closure in the Big Creek area. There are currently no winter outfitter-guides permitted for winter use including snowmobiling. The Forest Service have not received any application for winter outfitter/guide operations. The 2500 road is open in the winter to the Forest Service gate approximately 4.5 miles west of highway 89.
David Molebash	Montana Ranch Company	677		Grazing permit areas. Montana Ranch Company is permitted to graze national forest lands in the Pole Gulch/Eight-mile drainages and has been doing so for 30 plus years. The new travel plan will restrict our ability to manage our stock on these sections by restricting 4 wheeler access to established tracks as identified on a permit. While I understand that we can go to the district office to get permission to access areas that may be closed in the travel plan, sometimes an emergency can arise that does not allow time for this action. I feel that permit holders need to be allowed more latitude to use motorized vehicles for stock management on national forest lands.	Yellowstone	In alternative 7M, wheeled motorized uses will be prohibited except for designated routes. This includes the Pole Gulch/Eight mile areas. Temporary road use permits for specific activities (e.g., constructing fence or heavy maintenance of a water development, etc.) can be issued for specific activities associated with permitted operations. As necessary permits will be modified to be consistent with alternative 7M. Request for these permits will be evaluated by the District Ranger on a case-by-case basis.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The Fridley Fire complex area (Eightmile trail 132, North Dry Divide 135, North Fork Eightmile 155, North Fork Trail Creek 443, 139, 146, 182) would be very conducive to some expanded motorcycle opportunities since there already is public access at Pine Creek road (978) and Dry Creek road. Some of these trails could have access issues since they cross private land, but several are contained entirely on FS land.	Yellowstone	To maintain the wilderness character of the HPBH WSA, Alternative 7M would not provide summer motorized (i.e., motorcycle) opportunities on the Eightmile #132, North Dry Divide #135, North Fork Eightmile #155, North Fork Trail Creek #443, #139, #146, #182) trails.
Shawn Regnerus		1497		The new trail along the FS boundary in the Yellowmules is unacceptable. This trail will also have the effect of driving elk on to neighboring private lands in an area that is already experiencing problems with low hunter harvest due to lack of public access and complaints of elk depredation by private landowners. At the very least this trail should be closed by Sept. 1.	Big Sky	This trail designation was part of an agreement in a previous land exchange in order to resolve right-of-way conflicts and is not subject to amendment through this decision. If it is determined that elk are being adversely impacted a site specific measure may be used to address your concerns.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		If we are able to maintain the incredible hunting opportunities available in southwest Montana, we	General	Your opinion has been noted for the record.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				must come to grips with the fact that motorized hunting and long elk seasons may be mutually exclusive.		
Kirk Horn		237	West Yellowstone	Recently acquired National Forest land west of the Duck Creek junction along Hwy 191 and 287, Gallatin County. I clearly understand this area may not have received full consideration by the Travel Management team, as it was still being negotiated for purchase prior to your 2005 DEIS. However, during its winter of management under USFS, elk have been observed being displaced from riparian area by snowmobiles. In addition the sagebrush habitat of the property is home to wintering gray partridge. Hopefully, the Travel Management Team will be mindful of the continual impacts to sagebrush habitat by urbanization, road impacts, and summer and winter ATV use in the Madison Valley. In addition, this newly acquired property, especially in the sagebrush habitat, is important as subnivean (under the snow) habitat for several species of wildlife. Snowmobile trails, creating compacted snow/ice barriers across the sagebrush habitat is a significant impact to the subnivean habitat, not to mention wintering big game of the Duck Creek riparian area and species wintering in the sagebrush habitat.	Hebgen Basin	The commenter is correct that the Duck Creek land acquisition was still in a phase of negotiation at the time the Travel Plan DEIS was released. However the area was closed to snowmobile use by a special order implemented in 2005. Please refer to the ROD and Detailed Description of the Decision as to how this area will be managed under the Travel Plan.
Beth Horn		238	West Yellowstone	The Duck "Y" area recently became public land. Use will follow. We noted snowmobiles use this winter. The area acquired to protect the riparian. I would urge restrictions on motorized use in that area to reduce wildlife disturbance. Once a use is established, it is harder to control, so I suggest restrictions before motorized use is established.	Hebgen Basin	The Duck Creek land acquisition was still in a phase of negotiation at the time the Travel Plan DEIS was released. However the area was closed to snowmobile use by a special order implemented in 2005. Please refer to the ROD and Detailed Description of the Decision as to how this area will be managed under the Travel Plan. Unauthorized use in this area should be brought to attention of the District and law enforcement.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Elk Standards: the DEIS fails to ensure the continued health of the Gallatin elk population. The HEI and road density standards are effective tools for travel management and should remain a forest wide standard. In fact the best available science overwhelmingly uses density -- based models to measure the impacts of travel management on elk. The final travel plan should protect roadless areas and restore roaded areas and incorporate other	Issues	Refer to Issue 2 "Big Game (Ungulates)" in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. Ample analysis of potential impacts to big game species were addressed in the FEIS. No analysis or decision can ensure the continued health of elk populations, however the alternatives offer degrees of protection that should minimize adverse impacts from permitted travel. HEI and road density assessment will still be used to assess potential impacts from proposed projects, but will no longer be a standard. Refer to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				scientifically based principles to ensure long-term healthy ungulate populations. Roadless areas should remain roadless and should be protected from all motorized use.		Chapter 3-151,152 for specific rationale and details as to why this standard is no longer required.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		The forest should restrict motorized use on areas of crucial ungulate winter range and consider limiting all human use to designated routes in crucial winter range. This is especially true of the extremely limited winter range of big horn sheep and mountain goats.	Issues	Your concerns are noted for the record. The proposed alternatives address different levels of use and their potential impacts. Refer to Chapter 3 of the FEIS for details on the analysis of potential impacts to wintering ungulates.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Correction to Elk Winter Range Statements in Chapters 3-14: elk in the upper Gallatin migrates to three different winter ranges. Some migrate to winter ranges in the Yellowstone River Drainage, some to winter ranges in the Gallatin, both inside and outside Yellowstone National Park (primarily Taylor Fork And Porcupine), and some move toward winter ranges in the Madison Valley.	Issues	Corrections were made in FEIS to address your comments.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		Also, for elk, the distribution and quality of security was not evaluated. And too, the definition of security for elk was not correctly defined or applied, as were the recommendations for elk habitat effectiveness.	Issues	Refer to Chapter 3-23,42 in the FEIS. The security of elk habitat was address by each alternative in the FEIS. The elk security habitat definition was specifically quoted in the FEIS Chapter 3-20.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		The analysis that was done for wildlife, including elk as well as grizzly bears, is based on the "averaging out" of areas of low roads with areas of high roads. Specific problem areas cannot be addressed in this manner.	Issues	The best available science and analysis techniques were used to address potential impacts.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		There are no measures for summer displacement of elk for each travel planning area.	Issues	Refer to 3-23, 42 for the specific measures proposed to address elk summer displacement concerns for each planning area.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Upper Boulder snowmobile trail: at the extreme upper end of the snowmobile routes the terrain is more open and writers have the opportunity to get off the trail and "play "on the open slopes inside hills at the head of Basin Creek, Baboon Mountain, and Independence Peak. Part of this "play" area is also importance bighorn sheep and mountain goat winter range. In the upper Boulder, winter range for both species is extremely limited. The problem with snowmobiles occurs when riders encroach on the winter range by driving their machines up to the ridge top/cliff edge areas. The sheep and goats need to be allowed to use these windblown/windblown snow free areas without human-related interference.	Main Boulder	Access to this area is via a county road. The Forest cannot regulate access on a county road. The destination area in the independence area is primarily located on private land. The Forest is concerned about impacts to the resource and we actively patrol in the area annually to limit wilderness intrusions and impacts to wintering animals.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Continual encroachment on these cliff/windblown areas by snowmobilers could cause sheep/goats to avoid these areas resulting in a net loss in usable winter range. A second problem associated with snowmobile use of these cliffs areas is that the snowmobile trails may make it easier for large predators (coyotes, wolves) to access the sheep/goat winter range. When the snowmobile trails go directly to and encroach on sheep/goat winter range, there may be an increase in the likelihood of predation in these areas. We recommend a formally established buffer zone to keep snowmobile riders from encroaching upon sheep/goat winter range and putting additional stress on wintering animals. The buffer zone should extend down slow one quarter mile from the cliff and run from Independence Peak south along the ridge toward Monument Peak including the entire portion of the cliff outside the wilderness boundary.		
Amber Patterson		488	Bozeman	...I urge the Forest Service to designate the Gallatin Crest, Emerald and Hyalite Lake trails as non-motorized and to designate the Porcupine-Buffalo Horn and the Tom Miner Basin as snowmobile-free to protect wildlife winter range. I do not want to see it threatened by obnoxious vehicles that destroy habit, disturb peaceful hikers and wildlife, and pollute the air.	Non-motorized (General)	Your concerns are noted for the record. The proposed alternatives address different levels of use and their potential impacts. Varying levels and types of use were considered in each alternative and the concerns and desires of all potential users were used to develop the preferred alternative and the specific management direction for the Gallatin Crest, Emerald and Hyalite Lake trails. Refer to the ROD and the Detailed Description of the Decision for how these areas will be managed under the Travel Plan.
Leo P. Joron		494	Victor	Designate the Porcupine-Buffalo Horn and the Tom Miner Basin as snowmobile free to protect wildlife winter range.	Non-motorized (General)	Impacts to ungulate winter range were analyzed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. Refer to the ROD and the Detailed Description of the Decision for how these areas will be managed under the Travel Plan.
Jean D. and Rev. Charles E. Lange		500	Bozeman	Also, designate the Porcupine-Buffalo Horn & the Tom Miner Basin as snowmobile free as this is a wildlife winter range.	Non-motorized (General)	Impacts to ungulate winter range were analyzed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. Refer to the ROD and the Detailed Description of the Decision for how these areas will be managed under the Travel Plan.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		We strongly support the maintenance of the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail (199). However, we would like the opportunity to work with the Forest Service and the local snowmobile organization to adjust it to a higher location as it passes from Porcupine through Buffalo Horn. This is based on concern over wintering elk	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Your comment is noted. The Forest and District are willing to work with our partners to address potential trail relocation.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				use of this area and the trails elevation location relative to the winter range.		
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Snowmobile use in Porcupine/Buffalo Horn: we have serious concern over off trail use of snowmobiles in Buffalo Horn and Elkhorn creeks. Our post-hunting season aerial surveys indicate these drainages are a high-use area for wintering bull elk. These animals often aren't visible from the ground because they spend a great deal of time in the heavy lodgepole cover. However, they try to use the open meadows and sagebrush slopes as feeding areas. As winter progresses, snowmobile use in these drainages increases, as does the use of these open meadows and slopes by people operating snowmobiles. We have observed a decrease in elk use in these drainages as the winter progresses, possibly due to the motorized recreation. Therefore, we recommend the lower two thirds of the Buffalo Horn be designated a "area closure with a designated route".	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Your concerns are noted. Refer to the ROD and the Detailed Description of the Decision for how these areas will be managed under the Travel Plan.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		We also recommend closing Trail 199 from Buffalo Horn to Porcupine Creek to motorcycles (motorized traffic) until July 1 each year. This area is used extensively by grizzly bear and wolves during April-June and is an important calving area for elk.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Your concerns are noted. Specific seasonal restrictions have been evaluated in the FEIS to address this potential resource concern. Refer to the ROD and the Detailed Description of the Decision for how this area will be managed under the Travel Plan.
Dan Debar		221		The Eagle Creek Trail provides access for Virginia Peak and Bald Ridge. The drat EIS points out a need for summer elk range and it doesn't get any better than this area.	Shields	Your concern is noted. The alternatives devoloped provide management direction based on variable permitted use. Elk summer range concerns were incorporated into the preferred alternative for the Shields Travel Planning Unit.
Brent Ricks		967	Newdale ID	Snowmachines leave no tracks after the snow melts, they cause no erosion or harm to the land. When you push snowmachines out of the high country they go to lower elevations where the game animals winter which causes conflicts.	Snowmobiles	The resource concern from snowmobile use is specifically from noise and disturbance to wintering wildlife, not from habitat damage. Disturbance of wintering game animals was address in Chapter 3 of the FEIS .
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		The Pioneer Lakes Trail #79 must be closed and rehabilitated before it is reopened to motorized use. The Pioneer Lakes were proposed as a RNA and although this designation was not applied, they obviously have some unique features which should be protected.	Gallatin Roaded	Direction for management of the proposed Pioneer Lakes RNA is found in the Gallatin Forest Plan (III-62-63). The standards for recreation allow primitive, semi-primitive motorized, and semi-primitive non-motorized. Alternative 7M would be in compliance with this standard. Trail #79 is located for a short distance along the ridge that forms the northeast boundary of the proposed RNA and does not actually enter into it. Because the trail does not actually enter the area and is

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						located for a short distance along its perimeter the area's unique features would be protected.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The area around Big Sky used to be prime grizzly bear habitat, and continued use of that area is important for their long-term health. We hope the FS will adopt winter closures proposed in Alt 4, 5, and 6. By closing 41% of the lands the FS would begin to restore some of the crucial habitat that grizzly bears and other wildlife has lost to the development and rural sprawl that has occurred in that area in recent decades.	Big Sky	Due to the nature of private land ownership and development around Big Sky, there has and will continue to be an impact on wildlife habitat. In the Madison Range, Alternative 7M has 69% of the total area closed to snowmobile use. In the Big Sky TPA, 24% of the area will be closed to snowmobiles under Alternative 7M. This is an increase in area closed from 50% and 3% in these areas, respectively, over the current condition (Alternatives 1 and 2). In addition, the effects of snowmobiling on grizzly bears has been discussed in further detail in the Grizzly Bear Issue of the FEIS.
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		The area around Big Sky used to be prime grizzly bear habitat, and their continued use of that area is important for the health of the population. By closing 41% , as suggested in Alternatives 4, 5, and 6, rather than the 24% in Alternative 7, grizzly bears and other wildlife would begin to gain back some of the crucial habitat they've lost to the rampant resort development and rural sprawl that has occurred in that area in recent decades.	Big Sky	Due to the nature of private land ownership and development around Big Sky, there has and will continue to be an impact on wildlife habitat. In the Madison Range, Alternative 7M has 69% of the total area closed to snowmobile use. In the Big Sky TPA, 24% of the area will be closed to snowmobiles under Alternative 7M. This is an increase in area closed from 50% and 3% in these areas, respectively, over the current condition (Alternatives 1 and 2). In addition, the effects of snowmobiling on grizzly bears has been discussed in further detail in the Grizzly Bear Issue of the FEIS.
Rick Meis		1030	Bozeman	Cabin Creek: you fail to recognize the documented impact of human conflict during the pre-denning period of grizzly bears. The GNF has specifically decided to ignore the reference former IGBST biologists Knight and Blanchard made to the potential impact of snowmobile use on grizzlies in this pre-denning period.	Cabin Creek	The reference referred to by this comment is Knight et al.(1976). This article was indirectly referred to in the first draft of the Effects of Snowmobiles on Grizzly Bears Biological Assessment submitted to the USFWS by the Gallatin National Forest in 2001. The actual original Knight et al. (1976) citation could not be located, but it was cited to by Schallenberger (1980). Carole Jorgensen, consultation biologist with the USFWS, checked this reference to a den abandonment in the Yellowstone area and found that no one, including Dick Knight, could remember the incident that was cited here. Jorgensen contacted Dick Knight by phone, the author of the original citation, and found that he had no recollection of this den abandonment. Because this was the only reference found to actual den abandonment by a grizzly bear in the Yellowstone area, and it could not be substantiated, we corrected the final BA and removed the Schallenberger reference from the 2002 Final BA. This was corrected in a 1/25/2002 Update to the BA

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						(internal memo, Cherry 1/25/02). This is why we did not include this in the Grizzly Bear issue.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Snowmobiling is allowed by the Act when there is adequate snow cover and when it is compatible with wildlife needs. Considering that snow cover cannot be exactly predicted, that bears emerge at different times each year, and that climate change is creating shorter, drier, warmer winters, we strongly favor a snowmobile season limited to the period January 1 - March 15. In 2005, the first bear emerging from its den was sighted in the West Yellowstone area in late February.	Cabin Creek	Unclear what the "act" is, although the commenter is probably referring to the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The ESA, assures that activities of federal agencies may not jeopardize the continued existence of listed species. The grizzly bear/snowmobile issue was addressed more thoroughly in the Grizzly Bear Issue in the Final EIS. Please refer to that location. Also, in response to emergence dates. The age and sex class of bears that are the first to emerge from dens in the spring are usually adult males, the least vulnerable of grizzly bears to snowmobile use. They move directly to find food and do not remain in the snow-covered den area.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301		Grizzly Bear Subunits: under Alternative 6, Gallatin #3 would provide 93.1% secure habitat compared to 78.1% under Alternative 7. The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 6 management prescriptions in Gallatin #3 to achieve secure grizzly bear habitat standards.	Gallatin Crest	Gallatin #3 is one of the subunits "in need of improvement" according to the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy. Although there is not a standard set for the amount of secure habitat that each subunit should have, these subunits should be improved (increase in percent secure). The current percent secure in the subunit is in the between 54 and 60% (Alt. 1 and 2). Alternative 7M improves this to 70.2% secure. Alternatives 5, 6, and 7M are all substantial improvements in the percentage of secure habitat in this bear subunit, and they meet the requirements of the Conservation Strategy.
Monica Fella	Sierra Club, Grizzly Bear Project	661	Bozeman	The Gallatin Crest trail in H-P/B-H WSA has motorcycles allowed for 2 months out of the year. This area is important habitat for grizzlies and would have its security decreased by the presence of motorcycles.	Gallatin Crest	This statement is generally correct, however, the limited season is closer to 1 and 1/2 months of open trail which runs from July 16 -September 4 on the Gallatin Crest trail. This limited season as well as the limited number of motorcycles riders that can ride this type of terrain mean that although there will be some impact, it should be fairly minor, and motorized use stops prior to major whitebark pine usage in the fall.
Monica Fella	Sierra Club, Grizzly Bear Project	661		The snowmobile trail crossing through the H-P/B-H WSA, linking Paradise Valley and Highway 191. This too, is important habitat for bears, providing the only north-south corridor for grizzlies coming out of Yellowstone to the Gallatin Range. Also, there may be suitable denning habitat here.	Gallatin Crest	The grizzly bear/snowmobile issue was addressed more thoroughly in the Grizzly Bear Issue in the Final EIS. Please refer to that location. It is possible that some den sites occur in the HPBH WSA. Alternative 7M closes much of the motorized use on the east side of the Crest and also makes many of the trails motorcycle only that had been open to ATVs. Under Alternatives 6 and 7M, 72% of the Gallatin mountain range is closed to snowmobiling. This is an increase from the 27% that is

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						closed at present. There are large blocks of secure habitat in this area, and its utility as a wildlife corridor is not in danger. Most use of corridors by most species in unlikely to occur in the winter, but rather in the spring and fall.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Goals/Objectives/Standards: we suggest to add or highlight, regarding access to wildlife, your Goal J. regarding "administrative access That". We suggest you might consider including the following: Goal? Access to Wildlife. "Provide a range of access options that will accommodate reasonable access for the public to harvest wildlife during established recreational hunting seasons and view wildlife year-round." This approach could possibly generate other Objectives or Standards. One of the goals is to acknowledge the link between public land (Forest) access and wildlife harvest goals. Also to acknowledge the need for FW P. and the Gallatin to work together on these issues.	Goals and Objectives	The goal/objective expressed by FWP is incorporated into our overall access and resource goals and objectives, in that we are working to provide the widest array of travel opportunities, within the constraints of resources. This includes wildlife management goal and we believe will achieve the reasonable balance (between access for harvest and wildlife security) that FWP describes in their comment letter. FWP's access concerns for harvest and wildlife based recreation were considered on a route-by-route basis, and we are largely in agreement. Furthermore, portions of either the goal or objectives were not consistent with the OHV decision or were already included, from our perspective, in other guidance.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		We object to the goal to provide for "healthy old growth." This goal appears to be setting the stage to log old growth. However, you can't log old growth to health. Logging will degrade old growth.	Goals and Objectives	There is no intent by this statement to log old growth. Old growth includes snags and dead and down trees as critical components. That is what this statement refers to. This is not a vegetation amendment to the Forest Plan.
Noreen Breeding		454		Goal E. Why is Bear Canyon not included in the list of wildlife corridors? It should be added.	Goals and Objectives	It had been omitted by oversight and is now included in the list of wildlife corridors. This area was analyzed in the Biological Diversity issue.
Jason and Suzanne Hahn		54		Nowhere in the files on the CD was a map showing the PCA or its relationship to the various TPAs and the GNF. I assume it is due to the apprehension of whoever wrote this section of the DEIS to define specific lines on a map of where a grizzly bear will likely live? Maybe it is just an oversight.	Grizzly Bears	This was an oversight. Although a map was prepared, it was inadvertently omitted from the DEIS. It has since been posted on the website, and it is in the Grizzly Bear Issue in the FEIS. The map of the grizzly bear Recovery Zone and bear subunits has existed for many years, and this was what was used for the grizzly bear analysis. At this time, on the Gallatin National Forest, grizzly bears may be found almost anywhere south of I-90, except for perhaps the Deer Creeks on the Big Timber Ranger District.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The BMUs of the Gallatin Crest - Porcupine and Hebgen Lake - Lionhead encompass the most heavily motorized portions of these study areas. As such, almost one-quarter of the Gallatin Crest - Porcupine and nearly three-quarters of the Hebgen Lake-Lionhead study areas that fall within the Grizzly	Grizzly Bears	The grizzly bear subunits provide varying degrees of secure habitat. Secure habitat is defined as lying more than 500 m from a motorized route in the non-winter. Please refer to the Grizzly Bear issue for the percentages of secure habitat by subunit. By definition, there is no such thing as secure habitat in the winter

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Bear Recovery Zone fail to provide secure grizzly bear habitat during summer conditions. Larger portions of the bear management units fail to provide security, ranging from one-third to nearly three-quarters, and are in need of improvement. During winter conditions even more of the above study areas fail to provide secure habitat, 58% for the Gallatin Crest-Porcupine and 88% for Hebgen Lake-Lionhead.		when grizzly bears are denning. All the subunits 'in need of improvement' have been improved by Alternative 7M over their condition prior to travel planning.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		In the Gallatin subunit #3, while the FS preferred alternative will increase grizzly bear security, it still fails to meet the 70% threshold. The FS should meet the 70% threshold in this BMU subunit by implementing some of the designations in alt 5 and 6.	Grizzly Bears	Under Alternative 7M, Gallatin subunit #3 has 70.2% secure habitat (see Grizzly Bear Issue). Although 70% secure is desirable for subunits, it is not a threshold or standard against which we must assess security. The Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy names 3 subunits that need improvement, but does not state how much they should be improved. Gallatin #3 is one of these. The GYA subunits generally have a high average percent security due to large portions of subunits occurring in non-motorized areas such as Wilderness Areas and Yellowstone National Park. In areas of human habitation and development, it is more difficult to meet 70% secure.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		In the Henry's Lake subunit #2, an area of great ecological important to g. bears and for wildlife connectivity, the FS preferred alt will actually decrease security habitat to 59.7% and presumably lower the CEM threshold even lower than 45.7%. The lack of secure habitat for g. bears and other wildlife provided by Alt 7 must be addressed through additional motorized closures and targeted obliteration of roads and routes.	Grizzly Bears	Henry's Lake subunit #2 is also a 'subunit in need of improvement'. Alternative 7M provides 62.5% secure habitat (Please see Grizzly Bear Issue). This is an improvement over what existed prior to travel planning (Alternative 1 is 52.7% secure). Henry's Lake #2 also has a number of project roads which will go out of public use over time as well as administrative roads which are not open to the public.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The preferred alt also fails to improve security in Madison subunit #2, which has the highest percent of road density >2 mi/sq mi of any alt in the DEIS. As is the proposed action for Henry's Lake subunit #2, alt 7 provides less security (68%) than alts 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 (76%). Security must be increased in this subunit.	Grizzly Bears	Under Alternative 7M, Madison #2 subunit is 71.8% secure. This is an increase over what existed prior to travel planning (Alternative 1 is 66.7% secure). There is little opportunity to improve security here in a somewhat marginal subunit (see Grizzly Bear Issue) due to poor habitat quality and presence of conflict areas in a fairly developed area. Alternative 7M improves the security of this subunit more than any other action alternative.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Snowmobiling in crucial areas of g. bear habitat should be prohibited and end of the snowmobile season in areas of occupied g. bear habitat must be changed to March 15 to account for possible early	Grizzly Bears	The grizzly bear/snowmobile issue was addressed more thoroughly in the Grizzly Bear Issue in the Final EIS. Please refer to that section.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				emergence from dens and to avoid bear-human conflict. The negative effects of snowmobile use in spring and early summer on grizzly bears are similar to that of ATVs. In many areas of the forest, especially around Cooke City, snowmobiles continue to operate through the month of June. As a result, habitat security is significantly compromised.		
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	We also believe that snowmobiling needs to be removed from the eight den site areas where there is currently overlap. Snowmobiling dates in grizzly bear denning habitat should be ended long before early spring den emergence. The Conservation Strategy identified three subunits in need of improvement: Gallatin #3; Henrys Lake #2; and Madison #2. Alternative 7 increases security in Gallatin #3, but it fails to meet the 70% threshold. Additional roads and trails should be closed to motorized use to increase grizzly bear security. Alternative 5 and 6 significantly improve security and would likely exceed the 70% threshold. We would like to see these alternatives analyzed for their CEM ratings in the FEIS. The Forest Service should aim to meet the 70% threshold in this BMU subunit by implementing some of the designations in alternative 5 and 6. In the Henry's Lake #2 BMU subunit, alternative 7 decreases security habitat to 59.7% and presumably lowers the CEM threshold eve lower than 45.7%. This level of security is unacceptable. Alternatives 5 and 6 improve security. Strangely enough, alternatives 3 and 4 improve security too. there must be a mistake in the analysis or route designations for alternative 7. This is a very ecologically important area for grizzly bear habitat and wildlife connectivity. Alternative 7 fails to protect these resources in this subunit and must be improved with additional motorized closures and targeted obliteration.	Grizzly Bears	Refer to the Grizzly Bear Issue for additional information on grizzly bears and snowmobiles. In addition, because grizzly bears do not return to the same den every year, so from year to year, we do not know where they will den. Monitoring has not indicated conflict between snowmobiles and grizzly bear denning or emergence. The percentage of secure habitat in the 3 subunits 'in need of improvement' has been increased. The 70% referred to is not a threshold that must be reached, but a desirable percentage. Some subunits such as Gallatin #3 (Gallatin Crest) has been significantly improved (from approximately 54% to 70%). Henry's lake #2 subunit (Lionhead area) has been improved substantially, from approximately 53% at the present to 63%. Madison #2 subunit has little potential for improvement, and although it was improved to some degree in 7M to about 72% secure, there are reasons why this may not be the best place to improve security (see Grizzly Bear Issue). In all subunits, secure habitat either stayed the same or was increased in Alternative 7M. Many of the subunits have a very high percentage of secure habitat (see Comparison Table among alternatives). The analysis in the FEIS is much closer to CEM than it was in the DEIS. The reason it is not exactly the same is due to the attribution of seasonal features such as gates that are not available at this time. The analysis presented in the FEIS is actually a worst case scenario which considers a motorized route open all year if it is open even 1 day.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Grizzly bears are vulnerable to disturbance at their den sites. During denning, bears survive an extended period of low (or no) food availability by obtaining all energy through metabolism of fat reserves. Disturbance during denning may have more negative effects on bears than disturbance	Grizzly Bears	The Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team (IGBST) and Forest Service have not found that grizzly bears in the GYA are being disturbed at their den sites. This possibility has been monitored since the FS BA and FWS BO in 2001. The dens of known grizzly bears are typically not found in areas where snowmobiling is legal

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				during other times of the year when bears are mobile and additional energy sources are available. Mace and Waller believed the greatest potential for disturbance from snowmobile activity occurs when females with cubs are still confined to the din vicinity during spring and when there is dissension lower elevations and more gentle terrain, which is more suitable for snowmobiling.		or possible due to terrain and vegetation. The few bears found to den in areas legally open to snowmobiling appear to select inaccessible den sites. IGBST monitors via air every spring and has not found grizzly bear emergence in areas of snowmobile use at the same time. The grizzly bear/snowmobile issue was addressed more thoroughly in the Grizzly Bear Issue in the Final EIS. Please refer to that section.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Clearly, the future of the grizzly bear is tied to safeguarding roadless habitat, which research has repeatedly shown to be the key to grizzly bear recovery. Bears cannot tell the difference between motorized trails and roads. The effects of displacement, and disruption and direct and indirect mortality are the same. The following measures should be implemented to assure a viable population of grizzly bears on the Gallatin into the future. Outside of currently occupied grizzly habitat on the Gallatin, there will be a forest wide total motorized access routes into the standard of 1 mile per square mile. We also request that the travel plan address how it will improve habitat conditions for grizzly bears in the individual subunits that are currently below acceptable levels for effective grizzly bear habitat. We are concerned about three grizzly bear subunits that do not adequately protect grizzly bear habitats Gallatin #3, Madison #2, in Henry's Lake #2.	Grizzly Bears	A motorized route density standard is not included because the travel plan exposes all motorized routes in all parts of the Forest that will be considered open. We recognize that the standard of 1 mi/square mi is not realistic because some areas will have no motorized route densities, while others will exceed this figure. Using the percentage of secure habitat (non-motorized) is believed to make more sense for grizzly bears due to numerous studies that show the value of secure habitat (see Grizzly Bear Issue for further information). This is due to the proximity to development, past history, and terrain that does or does not allow route development. Rather than set this standard, we will be monitoring percent of secure habitat outside of the Recovery Zone but south of I-90. This is based on the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy Amendment. The percent secure habitat has been improved in the 3 subunits in need of improvement: Gallatin #3, Madison #2, and Henry's Lake #2 (Please see Grizzly Bear Issue).
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Gallatin #3: the Forest Service should aim to mean the 70% threshold and the subunit by implementing some of the designations and Alternatives 5 and 6.	Grizzly Bears	The 70% secure is not a threshold or standard, but a desirable percentage of secure habitat for a subunit. It comes from the average percentage of subunits that are secure in the GYA. The percentage secure is inflated by large percentages of secure for subunits that lie in Yellowstone National Park or in Wilderness Areas. When near towns and development, it is very difficult to reach 70% secure habitat. That is the issue 2 of the 3 subunits in need of improvement (Madison #2 and Henrys' Lake #2), which have been improved somewhat, while the third (Gallatin #3) has been significantly improved in Alternative 7M (see Grizzly Bear Issue for further information).
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Madison #2: the preferred alternative sales to improve security in Madison #2. It has the highest percent of road density >2 mi/sq mi and of any	Grizzly Bears	Some errors were discovered in the analysis for the DEIS. However, these have been corrected, and the analysis technique improved for the FEIS. In addition,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				alternative in the DEIS. In light is the preferred alternative have less security (68%) when alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 all have 76% security? It makes no sense that the motorized alternatives would have greater security than the preferred. If the Gallatin believes bears should avoid this area, then the recovery boundary line should be redrawn to include secure habitat somewhere else. Barring this, security must be increased in this area.		although Madison #2 has some issues with attractants and poor habitat values (See Grizzly Bear Issue). The Recovery Zone boundaries have never been changed, and will not be changed at this point in time. This is not the prerogative of the National Forest because the Recovery Zone was originally delineated by the US Fish and Wildlife Service and other agencies. Madison #2 was mapped largely as Management Situation 2 (MS2) which recognized its poor habitat quality. Security was increased for Madison #2 in Alternative 7M to approximately 72% and its road densities were decreased.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Henry's Lake #2: in Henry's Lake #2, alternative seven decreases security habitat to 59.7%. This level of security is unacceptable. This is a very ecologically important area for grizzly bear habitat and wildlife conductivity. Alternative 7 fails to protect these resources in this subunit and must be improved with additional motorized closures and targeted obliteration.	Grizzly Bears	Secure habitat was increased for Henry's Lake #2 under Alternative 7M to 62.%. This is an increase over the current level of secure habitat which is approximately 53%. This subunit has many project roads that will go out of use and many administrative routes that are not open to the public.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		in order to protect this most vulnerable segment of the grizzly bear population, and known denning habitat, closure of snowmobile seasons will be timed with the den emergence of females with cubs, or April 1.	Grizzly Bears	The grizzly bear/snowmobile issue was addressed more thoroughly in the Grizzly Bear Issue in the Final EIS. Please refer to that section.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Grizzly bears are vulnerable to disturbance at their den sites. During denning, bears survive an extended period of low (or no) food availability by obtaining all energy through metabolism of fat reserves. Disturbance during denning may have more negative effects on bears than disturbance during other times of the year when bears are mobile and additional energy sources are available. Mace and Waller believed the greatest potential for disturbance from snowmobile activity occurs when females with cubs are still confined to the din vicinity during spring and when there is dissension lower elevations and more gentle terrain, which is more suitable for snowmobiling.	Grizzly Bears	The grizzly bear/snowmobile issue was addressed more thoroughly in the Grizzly Bear Issue in the Final EIS. Please refer to that section. Monitoring conducted by the IGBST and Forest Service in the Yellowstone area has not found any conflicts between snowmobiles and grizzly bears.
Donald Lovely		758		Expanding grizzly bear secure habitat is cited for many of the new motorized restrictions. Given the recovery situation, we must be doing something right. Is it really a valid premise and really necessary	Grizzly Bears	Research and literature substantiate the fact the grizzly bears suffer less habitat displacement and mortality when motorized route densities are lower. The Gallatin NF has 3 subunits with relatively low security and are

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				to place further access restrictions at this time? Why mess with success?		termed 'in need of improvement' by the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy. The Forest is following direction from this document which should assure that grizzly bear recovery occurs and continues into the future. Grizzly bears in the Yellowstone have met their recovery criteria under conditions at about a 1998 baseline for habitat, however, this baseline does not measure the increase in human use of roads, trails and other facilities on the Forest.
David Keltner	Bear Creek Council	1366		The Grizzly Bear Conservation DEIS, if approved and the bear is delisted, would create road density standards. Why Is Gallatin National Forest attempting to remove the road density standards when they will be replaced in the near future?	Grizzly Bears	The Gallatin NF is attempting to follow the direction from the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy (2003), which should be very similar, it not exactly the same, as what comes out in the Grizzly Bear Amendment to the Forest Plans in the future if bears are delisted. Because the Conservation Strategy has a 1998 baseline on things such as secure habitat, this Travel Plan is the place to make sure that the Forest does these things now rather than having to go back and do them again if our Travel Plan did not take these into consideration. The Forest is following current direction for grizzly bear.
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		Finally, Alternative 7 is totally unacceptable for grizzly bear management in Madison #2. Alternative 7, in this case, appears to be a handout to ATV users at the expense of the grizzly bear and the American Public, in an area where the FS recognizes the need to decrease road density. This travel plan is the perfect opportunity for GNF to fulfill its responsibilities to improve habitat conditions for the grizzly in the most degraded subunits inside the PCA.	Grizzly Bears	There would be a small increase in secure habitat for grizzly bears in the Madison #2 BMS under Alternative 7M. Direction from the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy to increase secure habitat in the Madison #2 BMS would be met. High motorized route densities and low secure habitat values on National Forest lands in this subunit have resulted in part from the combination of U.S. highways, county and private roads, and major Forest Service access roads providing access to residential areas and other developed sites. As a result, opportunities for improving secure habitat in this subunit are somewhat limited. Additionally, habitat quality of this subunit is poor with limited natural foraging opportunities, and therefore further increases in secure habitat would result in minimal tangible benefits to grizzly bears. High mortality resulting from sanitation problems at developed sites on private and Forest Service lands would continue to be the major issue affecting grizzly bears in this BMS rather than motorized access. This area would continue to be managed with an emphasis on summer motorized recreational opportunities under Alternative 7M. Larger increases in grizzly bear secure habitat would be accomplished in areas of higher habitat

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						quality within the Madison #1, Hilgard #1 and #2, and Henry's Lake #2 BMS's that would lead to greater actual benefits to grizzly bears than what could be gained through further increases in secure habitat within the Madison #2 BMS.
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		Closing particular roads to rehabilitate habitat for grizzly bears has been on the agenda of Gallatin National Forest for a number of years. There have been discussions between the FS and conservation NGOs recently about holding a workshop to best determine how to improve habitat conditions for bears in these degraded BMUs. The NRDC would be more than willing to participate in such a workshop. We are confident that a solution can be found that will appeal to all parties involved.	Grizzly Bears	During the analysis for the proposed travel management plan the Forest Service considered input from biologists from Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, the Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team, and members of the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy Amendment EIS team as well as other received during this comment period. The Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (FACA) regulates the establishment, use and reporting of advisory committees. The procedural requirements of FACA would apply to the Forest Service if the agency takes the primary role in organizing a working group including non-governmental parties aimed at obtaining group-based advice and recommendations. To assume a primary role would require the Forest Service to establish a FACA-chartered group. Forest Service policy is to not establish a FACA chartered advisory committee, unless it is either specifically authorized by law or the Secretary of Agriculture determines that it is in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed by law (Forest Service Manual 1351.03).
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		It would have been much more productive for the Forest Service to conduct their road density analysis using traditional CEM guidelines for secure habitat, rather than recalculating it for forest land only. While it is true that the travel plan has no jurisdiction over non Forest Service roads, those roads are still there, an have a negative impact on grizzly bears. Neglecting county, state, and federal roads within a 1 mile buffer of forest land, or even inside of it, paints a picture of habitat quality that is much better than what actually exists on the ground.	Grizzly Bears	The reanalysis for the FEIS grizzly bear issue includes all lands and route jurisdictions. This makes the figures comparable to the CEM figures. However, it is best to compare amongst the alternatives.
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		A member of the public reading this DEIS, and looking at the charts comparing road density with CEM vs. road density in any of the alternatives would see what looks like an improvement in secure habitat no matter which alternative is chosen. That is false advertising. For the public to truly make an informed	Grizzly Bears	It is true that all action alternatives reduce motorized route density from what currently exists on the ground today. Any route that does not appear on a map in the alternatives will not be a legal route. Routes that are not designated will be monitored for use and closed over time if they are receiving use. This includes project

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				decision, they need to be able to see the whole picture of road density, which means taking into account roads that exist on the ground, whether or not they are part of the Forest Service system. And, considering the amount of money that was spent on this analysis, it would have been useful to have a road density table that can be used for more than just the travel plan. Road density standards for grizzly bears need to be improved before the final draft is released.		routes. This is not false advertising. The implementation of the Travel Plan on the Forest under any action alternative, will maintain or improve secure habitat for grizzly bears. Some routes have been and will be obliterated and/or closed. The grizzly bear analysis was improved between draft and FEIS. The standards for grizzly bear appear in the Grizzly Bear Issue (see that issue for further detailed information).
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		In critical areas of grizzly bear habitat, the Travel Plan should create seasonal closures. Especially where summer motorized vehicle use is not allowed, snowmachines should be prohibited after bears emerge from their dens, usually in mid-April.	Grizzly Bears	The grizzly bear/snowmobile issue was addressed more thoroughly in the Grizzly Bear Issue in the Final EIS. Please refer to that location.
Joe Polus		1487		Grizzly Bear Recovery Areas - Segregate motorcycles from other motorized use in these classifications. Segregate single track trails from roads & ATV trails. Motorcycle use in Griz Recovery Areas is one of the only human uses of these areas that does not and will not contribute to Grizzly mortality. Motorcycles do not surprise and scare grizzlies - Leave these areas open to motorcycles.	Grizzly Bears	The commenter may be correct that motorcycles have less or different impacts on grizzly bear displacement and mortality, however, there is insufficient research on the effects of different types of motorized vehicles to separate them in the grizzly bear analysis. See the Grizzly Bear Issue for further details. In any event, there are a number of routes open to motorcycles only.
Monica Fella	Sierra Club, Grizzly Bear Project	661		Currently there are 3 grizzly bear subunits that are marked as "in need of improvement" in the Gallatin. Madison #2 is not improved under the preferred alternative and does not meet the direction of the Conservation Strategy. Henry's Lake #2 is only slightly improved under Alternative 7. Crandall/Sunlight #1, Hilgard #2 are also decreased in the amount of secure habitat which does not meet the direction of the Conservation Strategy by decreasing the amount of secure habitat. In order for delisting of the grizzly to occur these breaches of the Conservation Strategy must be corrected.	Grizzly Bears	Some changes have occurred in the Travel plan between DEIS and EIS. The percentage of secure habitat in the 3 subunits 'in need of improvement' (Gallatin #3, Madison #2, Henrys Lake #2) has been increased. The 70% referred to is not a threshold that must be reached, but a desirable percentage. Gallatin #3 (Gallatin Crest) has been significantly improved (from approximately 54% to 70%). Henry's lake #2 subunit has been improved substantially, from approximately 53% at the present to 63%. Madison #2 subunit has little potential for improvement, and although it was improved in Alternative 7M to about 72% secure, there are reasons why this may not be the best place to improve security (see Grizzly Bear Issue). In all subunits, secure habitat either stayed the same or was increased in Alternative 7M from the existing situation. Many of the subunits have a very high percentage of secure habitat (see Comparison Table among alternatives).
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental	587		While we are generally pleased with proposed Goals F, G, and H, Objectives F-1, F-2 and Standard F-1 in	Grizzly Bears	The percentages to which secure habitat is increased in this FEIS will be in place for a long time. Any proposed

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office			regard to Grizzly Bear protection and recovery, we suggest that additional restrictions in motorized use be considered to increase the percentages of secure habitat in these Grizzly Bear Subunits that have relatively low percentages of secure habitat.		new routes that change this will have to go through NEPA and meet this same direction. All grizzly bear subunits have either remained the same or increased the percent secure habitat. Secure habitat was increased in the 3 subunits in need of improvement in Alternative 7M. Gallatin #3 has been significantly improved (from approximately 54% to 70%). Henry's lake #2 subunit has been improved substantially, from approximately 53% at the present to 63%. Madison #2 subunit has little potential for improvement, and although it was improved in Alternative 7M to about 72% secure, there are reasons why this may not be the best place to improve security (see Grizzly Bear Issue). Many of the subunits have a very high percentage of secure habitats (see Comparison Table among alternatives).
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		It is not clear to us why Objective F-1 fails to mention the need to reduce total summer motorized access route density and increase core secure) habitat in the Gallatin/Madison Grizzly Bear Subunit, the Gallatin #3, Madison #3 and Henry's lake #2 Subunits since all of these Bear Subunits have relatively low secure habitat percentages that need improvement. This should be clarified in the FEIS.	Grizzly Bears	Some of the grizzly bear goals, objectives, etc. were clarified or expanded in the FEIS. See both the Grizzly Bear Issue and proposed Forest-wide direction in the FEIS.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		The impact of the grizzly bear conservation strategy amendment, which will be the same as the Travel Planning amendment, was never identified. The proposed change in forest plan direction for the grizzly bear will result in a significant decrease in habitat protection. There will be unlimited roading and project activity outside of existing security areas, a problem that will result in ongoing degradation for the grizzly bear. Security habitat itself can be reduced by thousands of acres, another impact to the bear.	Grizzly Bears	The Forest Travel Plan Amendment uses the direction from the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy (2003) and attempts to use expected direction from the Grizzly Bear Amendment. The Grizzly Bear Amendment to the Forest Plans for the GYA will likely be signed after the Travel Plan ROD. The Grizzly Bear Amendment does not allow unlimited roading outside of security areas. Comments on the Grizzly Bear Amendment should be directed to that NEPA document. Please see the Grizzly Bear Issue for further information.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		The impact of current roading, or the current condition of security areas, on the grizzly bear and bull elk were never evaluated. All the Travel Plan amendment, as well as the grizzly bear conservation strategy, does for analysis is to define specific roading conditions in various portions of recovery habitat. The impact that these have on the bear are never measured. Areas where significant negative impacts are occurring, such as in the Gardiner area,	Grizzly Bears	The issue of grizzly bear was analyzed in depth in the DEIS and FEIS. This included the current condition of motorized routes and security areas. The purpose of this document is to analyze the effects of the different travel management alternatives on different issues such as different wildlife species, and present the analysis. In the case in which some alternative has an effect that is outside of some standard or guideline, suggestions were made to modify the effects. Please see the Grizzly

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Taylor Fork area, and South Plateau, are not identified for mitigation or improvement. This same problem exists for security habitat. There is not analysis of how well this security habitat meets the needs of the bear as per habitat quality, distribution and size.		Bear Issue analysis.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	Snowmobiling should be prohibited because this area overlaps the Gallatin #3 grizzly bear management area, with its secure grizzly habitat and den sites.	HPBH WSA	The grizzly bear/snowmobile issue was addressed more thoroughly in the Grizzly Bear Issue in the Final EIS. Please refer to that location.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		TWS strongly supports the identification and protection of key wildlife corridors in the forest. If we are to maintain healthy wildlife populations it is critical that these corridors are managed to ensure connectivity between core areas of roadless lands. The management prescription for those areas must provide assurance that habitat cover is protected; road density reduced and motorized use minimized. The preferred alternative does not provide those assurances especially in the Bridger-Bangtail area (North Bridgers, West Bridgers North, West Bridgers South, Fairy Lake and Bangtails travel planning units).	Issues	Few areas have scientific documentation that they serve as a known corridor for a known species. Much of what we think we know about corridors is speculative. For that reason, certain areas were focused upon through which larger animals such as big game and wide-ranging carnivores are believed to move, especially to other mountain ranges. The Bridger Mountains may serve as a north-south connection for some species of wildlife. The connection to the south is likely Bear Canyon which was analyzed in the Biodiversity Issue (please refer to that issue). The connection to the north was the North Bridgers which was also analyzed in the Biodiversity Issue. The corridor in the North Bridgers was analyzed. All alternatives were analyzed for motorized route densities and percent non-motorized habitat (core or non-motorized habitat) was analyzed in the General Wildlife Issue (please refer to that issue). The Bridger Mountains does have some TPAs with a fairly low percent core habitat. Several subunits mentioned in this comment are low core when motorized and nonmotorized routes are combined, but have fairly high core when nonmotorized routes are not considered. The Bangtails and Fairy Lake have the lowest percent core habitat with motorized use. Buffering of these routes shows that the west side of the Bridgers appears to have fairly good potential to serve as a corridor by animals moving north-south in this mountain range (see Core map in project record). Animals will still use areas with low percent core habitat, but they may tend to avoid periods of high human use.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Federal courts have interpreted NEPA to require land management agencies to consider and evaluate impacts to biological corridors. The standard for	Issues	This issue was addressed in the Biological Diversity section of the FEIS. Please refer to that issue and to Forest goals, objectives, standards and guidelines. In

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				such a review is the same "hard look" NEPA requires of other environmental effects. The FS has an affirmative duty to analyze the effects of each of the alternatives impossible biological corridors in the area, including species-specific assessments of corridor location and use. This assessment should place emphasis on the migration corridors for large roaming species and endangered, threatened and sensitive species.		addition, numerous comment responses address this issue. See the response to the previous comment by the same organization.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The DEIS identifies several linkage areas. It is important that the TP identifies all the key corridors on the Forest and that forest-wide standards and goals apply to them. We encourage you to include site specific goals and objectives for these TPAs to provide wildlife connectivity and to manage them for their wildlife linkage values.	Issues	Please refer to responses to other comments on linkages/corridors and the Biological Diversity Issue. Forest direction is included for corridors.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The transportation route alternatives in the DEIS need to be evaluated spatially to assess the impact of habitat fragmentation on wildlife resources. Calculating landscape fragmentation metrics is an effective way to assess such impacts.	Issues	Three travel corridors were analyzed in the FEIS. The measure used for analysis was motorized route density. This, in conjunction with the maps of the alternatives and core habitat (see project record), provide a visual image of fragmentation of each area by routes. Landscape fragmentation metrics are most often used for vegetation management which is not part of this travel plan (Fahrig 2003).
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The results of our spatial analysis suggest that the preferred alternative transportation route network in the Bridgers-Bangtails, Gallatin Crest-Porcupine, and Hebgen Lake-Lionhead is endangering wildlife populations through fragmentation of habitat. These three areas present some of the best opportunities to conserve wildlife habitat. The pressures on wildlife from recreation are likely to increase during the 15-20 year life of this transportation management plan. Therefore, accurately assessing the effects of transportation routes on wildlife and taking action to ameliorate these impacts through the transportation planning is essential.	Issues	Motorized route density was analyzed for 3 wildlife corridors identified on the Forest. The areas identified by the commenter include some of these corridors. There are some parts of the Forest that are more motorized than others as can be seen in route densities and also in percent core in the General Wildlife Issue (see Core maps in project record), but they are generally not motorized to the point that they serve as a barrier to wildlife movement. Traffic on motorized routes is likely to increase in the future. This was discussed in the Recreation Issue. In addition, all action alternatives of the Travel Plan improve the situation over the current condition, and in many cases, such as the southern part of the Gallatin Range, are a big improvement. This Travel Plan and its implementation are beneficial to wildlife and decrease motorized use in most areas of the forest. The TPAs of Gallatin Crest and Porcupine/Buffalo Horn have good percentages of core habitat for motorized use only, and, in addition, some of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						the routes have seasonal restrictions. Wildlife will show little displacement in these TPAs. The Bridger/Bangtails have some TPAs with very low percent core. Fairy Lake and Bangtails have the lowest core for motorized use. However, the west side of the Bridgers is relatively non-motorized and allows for wildlife use. Wildlife may use the east side of the Bridgers and Bangtails differently, and avoid times of high human use. The Lionhead TPA has fairly good core with both motorized and non-motorized uses. The Hebgen Lake Basin BPA has low percent core with both uses. This is an area that has little potential for change given the range among the alternatives (see General Wildlife Issue). This Travel Plan is meant to allow for adaptive management, and as we learn more about corridors and linkages across landscapes and how animals use them, as well as human use in these areas, we will be able to adapt to better allow for wildlife movement. H45
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Manage conservatively if wildlife data is not available - We recommend that the Gallatin National Forest manage transportation routes in concert with the "precautionary principle" of conservation biology, which states that precautionary measures should be taken when a certain activity or inactivity threatens to harm human health or the environment, even when science has not fully established cause-and-effect relationships. Lack of accurate boundaries for wildlife habitats and an incomplete understanding of the impacts of roads and other types of uses on wildlife area real problems that demand additional research. However, such gaps in knowledge must not stop or delay decisions to protect wildlife resources by reducing the number and mileage of transportation routes across a landscape.	Issues	The effects of the travel plan alternatives on wildlife have been analyzed using the best available information. We will never have as much information or science as we would like to, but getting the Forest under a travel plan is critical for many resources, including wildlife. Motorized route densities will be reduced from the present situation in almost all TPAs. The effects of travel management on wildlife and other resources was carefully considered by the decision makers. As we learn more about wildlife use of the landscape as well as human use, we will be able to adapt to this new information in order to protect the resources of Forest.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Evaluate the impacts of motorized routes on wildlife and other resources as part of subsequent ongoing adaptive management. Ongoing NEPA related monitoring of wildlife impacts from roads and motorized routes, and off road travel should be defined in the final travel plan and implemented over the life of the plan.	Issues	Monitoring is an important part of this Travel Plan. Monitoring will be used to assure that the plan is doing what we said it would do and that its impacts are acceptable. If impacts are found not be acceptable, change will occur to rectify this.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	We appreciate the attention to wildlife linkage and the level of fine scale analysis in the Bear Canyon,	Issues	An analysis of wildlife linkages was conducted in the 3 areas mentioned and is found in the Biodiversity Issue.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				north Bridgers and Lionhead TPAs. For all of these TPAs, we would like to see larger-scale linkage analysis, as well. How well will wide-ranging animals travel through the Gallatin, Bridgers and Bangtails. Are there any impediments to mountain range-wide linkage.		As mentioned previously, the only major impediment known to exist for large, wide-ranging animals on the Forest is Interstate-90. Other highways form a lesser impediment depending on width, speed, and other factors. High motorized route densities may keep an animal from easily traveling through an area, or animals may adapted by traveling through these areas at times of low human use. The analysis for the General Wildlife Issue can be used to look at percent core, or non-motorized, habitat for wildlife (see the project record for Core map). Core has routes buffered by 1 km (not the same buffer as grizzly bear secure habitat). By looking at individual TPAs and percent core, especially for motorized use, one can get an idea how these TPAs may be used or traveled through by wildlife. Tables for each mountain range are presented here (Gen. Wildlife Issue). There are a handful of TPAs that have low percent core when compared to the rest of the Forest. The Forest core average not including Wilderness acres is 52%, and including Wilderness is 70% core with respect to motorized use. The TPAs with low percent core for motorized use are Gallatin Roaded, Hyalite, Hebgen Lake Basin, Bangtails, and Fairy Lake. Although there are some areas of low core, on a mountain range basis, there appears to be available habitat to allow for wildlife movement through these areas.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	It is important that the Gallatin Travel Plan identifies all of the key corridors on the Forest and that forest-wide standards and goals apply to them. We would also like to see wildlife linkage analyzed and provided for in these areas. In past comments, we have requested site-specific goals and objective in these TPAs to provide wildlife connectivity.	Issues	The Gallatin National Forest has identified and analyzed 3 key linkages in the Biodiversity Issue. The Goals, standards, objectives, and guidelines allow for protection of linkages including linkages not yet identified. At this time the research and science related to linkages does not allow us to identify all linkages on the Forest. We have analyzed three locations that are believed to be corridors and could serve as linkages to other mountain ranges. The linkages we have focused on are those that would primarily be used by larger wildlife such as big game and wide-ranging carnivores. Much of the linkage information in this area to date is conjecture, with only Bozeman Pass in our area having been substantiated with data collection. Some other linkages are logical and may provide important connections to other mountain ranges, and two of them have been addressed in further

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						detail along with Bozeman Pass in the Biodiversity Issue. In addition, the General Wildlife Issue addresses core, non-motorized habitat, and can be used to help determine impacts of motorized routes and likely wildlife movement. The travel plan allows us to use adaptive management as further scientific information becomes available. Corridors not currently identified can be identified in the future and offered protection.
Timothy L. Ravndal	Montana Multiple Use Association, Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1032		It appears to us that all primitive roads and local roads have been counted in the road density evaluation when, in order to be in conformance with the Forest Plan and the models and studies used to develop it, none of the primitive roads should have been used and only 25% of local roads should have not been closed in the analysis. The impact of motorized roads and trails on wildlife has been overstated because of this deficiency.	Issues	In the grizzly bear issue for the FEIS, administrative and project roads were separated out from public roads. The project and administrative roads were dropped from the General Wildlife Issue also for the FEIS. This varied somewhat by issue, but is explained in that issue write-up. The impact of project roads that will go out of use over time or have already revegetated, and administrative roads that are not open to public use undoubtedly have different impacts than normal roads open to everyone.
Julie Hager		1306		In the Federal EIS for a winter use in Yellowstone Park, there is documented scientific research that shows that wildlife is more afraid of the human figure any motorized vehicle. In spite of these observations in documented science, you are using wildlife as a reason to close trails to motorized use.	Issues	In this study, believed to be either Cassierer et al. 1992 or Cassierer 1990, which were cited in the General Wildlife Issue, it was found that humans on foot or skis displaced elk as easily as motorized users. The reason for this is that humans on foot had a greater influence on wildlife than humans on motorized vehicles was due to habituation. In the Park, motorized vehicles, including snowmobiles, are restricted to designated routes. However, humans on foot are allowed to travel cross-country. The influence of anyone or anything showing up unexpectedly does not allow wildlife to habituate to its presence. This scenario allows wildlife to habituate to snowmobile use on designated routes but they can rarely habituate to humans showing up unexpectedly in an unexpected place. The findings of these studies cannot be extrapolated to say that humans on foot have greater impact on wildlife than humans on motorized vehicles in all cases.
Gayle Joslin	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1358	Helena	From the perspective of wildlife refugee, minimum noxious weed expansion, sensitive species concerns, the alternative that recognizes and manages for the least amount of motorized travel will be the best option for most wildlife. Motorized recreation and serious consequences on wildlife that have been described in the Montana chapter of the	Issues	This Montana Chapter of The Wildlife Society reference entitled "Effects of Recreation on Rocky Mountain Wildlife" was used extensively and in numerous issues in the preparation of this FEIS.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Wildlife Society report: Effects of Recreation on Rocky Mountain Wildlife. This report and a searchable database can be found at www.moantanatws.org.		
David Keltner	Bear Creek Council	1366		The US Forest Service has stated that connectivity is not within the scope of the planning process. Bear Creek Council does not understand why the Forest Service refuses to address this issue in any way. While the Gallatin National Forest Travel Plan does not control the use of National Forests in Idaho or other areas in Montana, it does offer protection to habitat corridors identified throughout the conservation community and the USFWS grizzly recovery plan. A continued resistance to address the need to protect wildlife corridors coupled with the removal of routing standards is very troubling.	Issues	The Gallatin National Forest has addressed connectivity in this Travel Plan FEIS. This information can be found in the Biodiversity Issue. Bear Canyon, the North Bridgers and the Lionhead area were specifically addressed and there are items in the section on goals, objectives, standards and guidelines.
Tony Jewett and Tim Stevens	National Parks Conservation Association Northern Rockies Regional Office	1452		We ask that the Forest expand the snowmobile closure season identified in the preferred alternative through March 31, instead of December 1, as the expanded closure date will best assure a minimum of disturbance of denning grizzly bears and bears emerging from hibernation in the spring.	Issues	The grizzly bear/snowmobile issue was addressed more thoroughly in the Grizzly Bear Issue in the Final EIS. Please refer to that location.
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		We ask that the revised EIS take stronger steps towards managing for corridors in the outskirts of Gallatin National Forest. In future planning, especially Forest Plan revisions, we request that Gallatin work to establish corridors for wildlife. In addition, we strongly support limiting road density in these critical corridor areas.	Issues	The Gallatin National Forest has addressed connectivity in this Travel Plan FEIS. This information can be found in the Biodiversity Issue of the FEIS. Bear Canyon, the North Bridgers and the Lionhead area were specifically addressed and there are items in the section on goals, objectives, standards and guidelines. Motorized route densities were not found to be excessive in these areas, and the Travel Plan identifies all motorized routes that will exist in these areas without further NEPA analysis.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association			We are concerned about what appear to us to be unsupported conclusions in the wildlife section of the FEIS and a bias of information on motorized versus non-motorized impacts. These statements and conclusions seem to be based solely on one-sided information or personal opinion. We are very concerned about the use of this information and statements because they seem to be unsubstantiated, they seem to represent a strong bias against motorized recreation, and they are taken as fact without adequate supporting data,	Issues	In the General Wildlife Issue in the FEIS, literature was searched for and its findings presented. It was apparent from the literature that there are more articles on negative impacts from motorized use on wildlife than there were on no impacts or positive impacts. Literature citations were given. In some issues, there is little or no information that says motorized use has a neutral or positive effect on a species, such as grizzly bear. One article that CTVA cited in their letter by Swarthout et al. (2003) discusses effects of hikers on Mexican Spotted Owls during the breeding season. The article concludes

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				studies, etc. The attached list of issues documents that the impact of motor vehicles on wildlife is over-stated and that hikers have a similar or greater impact. We ask that these statements be further substantiated or stricken from the record which also requires a reanalysis of the impacts, conclusions and recommendations.		that hikers disturb these owls at this time of year. The authors did not compare this with motorized activity. The study occurred during the breeding season probably increases the likelihood of a reaction to disturbance. The fact that humans on foot can disturb wildlife is not disputed (see General Wildlife Issue). Another study cited by CTVA was Freddy et al. 1986. This study assessed the responses of mule deer to people on foot and snowmobiles. In this study, deer generally responded to humans on foot more than snowmobiles. Deer responded to snowmobiles at further distances, they responded at a medium rate two both types of disturbances at similar distances, and deer responded at a higher rate at greater distances to humans than snowmobiles. Snowmobiles were restricted to existing trails while humans were not. Deer spend more time responding to humans afoot than snowmobiles, probably because people spent more time walking than snowmobiles spent moving across the landscape. Intensity of responses by deer depended upon distance between animals and disturbances. To minimize responses by deer, people should remain more than 334 m from deer and snowmobiles should remain more than 470 m from deer. Differences in responses by deer to humans on foot and snowmobiles are affected by noise level, whether or not the disturbance is on a trail or off a trail, and this in turn influenced whether or not the deer could habituate to the disturbance. Another study by Shultz and Bailey (1975) found that elk in Rocky Mountain National Park had longer flight distances for an approaching human on foot vs an approaching vehicle. Elk were more apt to trot away from a person on foot than a vehicle. Again, vehicles in this study were restricted to roads and walking on foot was not. This affects the ability of the elk to habituate to these disturbances. The study cited by CTVA by Ward and Cupal (1976) could not be located due to an incomplete citation. A recent study by Wisdom et al. (2005) researched the effects of numerous off-road activities on deer and elk. These were ATV, horseback, mountain bike and hiking. Elk reactions were greater to ATV and mountain bikes than to horseback and foot traffic. Elk are more likely to flee from ATV and mountain bikes than horseback or foot traffic. Mule deer showed little

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						difference in response to the off-road activities. Not all variables such as terrain and vegetative cover were measured in this study. Preisler et al. 2006 studied the effects of ATVs on elk. They found that elk may show a slight response to an ATV as far as 3000 m away. The closer the elk were to a road, the greater their response. Elk appear to perceive roads or trails as predictable locations of human disturbance. Elk response also increases with the angle of the approach of the humans. Some animals will 'freeze' in response to ATVs passing very close. Elk also appear to habituate to human use over time. It is apparent that different studies on impacts of various uses that assess different variables by different methods have many kinds of different results. Gilbert (2003) cautions against interpreting studies that show more intense reactions to people on foot or skis than snowmobiles. Habituation only occurs with predictable and consistent stimuli are associated with harmless outcomes. Conclusions that remain the same are: 1) wildlife can be disturbed by many different activities, 2) wildlife can habituate to predictable activities that cause no harm, 3) the degree to which any activity disturbs an animal depends on many factors, and 4) disturbance of wildlife should be considered in making decisions.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		The Forest Plan and supporting documents and the methodology presented do not use primitive 4-wheel drive roads in the analysis and due to non-impact and uses only 25% of the local roads in the modeling to account for the reduced impact due to the low level of travel. It appears to us that all primitive roads and local roads have been counted in the road density evaluation when, in order to be in conformance with the Forest Plan and the models and studies used to develop it, none of the primitive roads should have been used and only 25% of local roads should have been used in the analysis. The impact of motorized roads and trails on wildlife has been overstated because of this deficiency and we ask that the analysis be corrected, the conclusions rewritten, and additional motorized routes be added back into the preferred alternative.	Issues	The Forest Plan direction for access management is Amendment 19 to the Forest Plan which was amended in 1996. This amendment makes no distinction between motorized roads and motorized trails count them the same in the analysis and refers to them as motorized routes. The recent grizzly bear literature and the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy for the Yellowstone area do not make a distinction among types of motorized routes. Therefore, types of motorized routes were not given different weights. It is possible that this overstates the impacts of some routes on wildlife, but the more recent literature and preponderance of research does not provide evidence to weigh different types of motorized routes differently.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Robert F. Stewart	United States Department of the Interior Office of the Secretary	731	Colorado	Page 3-306 Chapter 3 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Issue 15: Noise - In the first paragraph, it is stated that "recent campaigns" of organized OHV clubs focus on communicating…. That "noise annoys" and encouraging (club members) to voluntarily quiet down their machinery..." And later (page 3-309), "(r)ecreationists seeking quiet...., may find noise from motorized recreational vehicles to be additive (and annoying) to ambient noise." Although noise from use of OHVs and snowmobiles may be annoying to humans, effects of snowmobile noise on some large mammalian wildlife has been researched and found physiologically disruptive. No such mention of this effect on animals, however, was made in the DEIS. Thus, we suggest for consideration additional information which discusses stress-induced illness to wildlife mammals.	Issues	In response to this comment, additional literature was sought, summarized, and included in the General Wildlife Issue. This is found under the Habitat Quality section in that issue. The primary reference used for this, since it was a synthesis of the literature was: Bowles, A. E, 1995. Responses of wildlife to noise. In Pages 109-156 In Knight, R.L. and K.J.Gutzweiler. eds. Wildlife and recreationists: coexistence through management and research. Island Press. Washington DC. 372 pp.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		There are no specific conclusions regarding the impacts of the various alternatives on wildlife, including the grizzly bear and Canada lynx. Even though the Lynx Conservation and Assessment Strategy (LCAs) will not meet standards, these impacts are not specifically measured as per conservation of this species.	Issues	There are specific conclusions in each issue for each alternative in the issues, see for example Grizzly Bear Issue and Lynx Issue.
Brian Hawthorn	Blue Ribbon Coalition	1196		We are aware of studies that show that wildlife habitat effectively is not substantially affected by motorized vehicles. Additionally, we are aware of studies that wildlife are likely to be disturbed by walking persons. Therefore, we intend to vigorously challenge any proposed seasonal restrictions on motorized uses of roads and trails or snowmobiles based on flawed or incomplete data or assumptions.	Issues	Please see the issue responses for effects of various activities related to travel management on wildlife species. The General Wildlife Issue and Grizzly Bear summarize much research. The preponderance of literature shows that most wildlife is more affected by motorized vehicles than by non-motorized use. There are some exceptions that have reasonable explanations, such as wildlife habituation to a certain type of use.
Brian Hawthorn	Blue Ribbon Coalition	1196		Affects to wildlife cause by "quiet, non-motorized recreation" was not sufficiently disclosed and analyzed resulting in flawed conclusions. Thus, predicted outcomes are not supported by the science.	Issues	There is less information in the literature on quiet, non-motorized recreation and its effects on wildlife, however, such information that was found is referred to in the issue analyses, especially in the General Wildlife issue.
Brian Hawthorn	Blue Ribbon Coalition	1196		The application of open motorized vehicles road and trail density standards is another flawed concept utilized in the Travel Plan DEIS. There is no site specific research available that makes a connection between density of vehicle use/density of roads and	Issues	There are a number studies that show that higher open motorized route density can have negative effects on certain wildlife species. The literature used to support analysis methodology is disclosed for each issue discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				trails, and big game survivability or herd health trends or even wildlife habitat effectiveness.		
David Cole		109	Bozeman	Protection of various animals (elk, deer, wolverines, lynx, moose, etc) is another one. Anyone who as rider and hunted/hiked on foot has seen the comparative "disturbance" between walking and riding - and knows that motorized is not more frightening to the animal. This was also proven many years ago in a University of Wyoming study monitoring elk flight response to foot, foot and dog, horse, and motorized traffic. Of these, the motorcycle caused the least disturbance to the elk- by a significant margin!	Issues	There is much anecdotal information on the effects of various activities on wildlife. The variations in wildlife responses are due to many variables such as type of use, animal species, ability to habituate to use, etc. (see General Wildlife Issue). In addition, animals may be reacting to disturbance but the reaction is not a visible one to humans (e.g.. an increased heart rate). Although the study referred to was not located, it is suspected that habituation plays a role in why the motorcycle appeared to disturb elk the least. Depending on what is allowed in an area, all of these modes of conveyance may be on or off trail. Those that are on a trail are more predictable and more likely to be habituated to or avoided by wildlife. See responses to the Capital Vehicle Trail Association.
Russ Ehnes	MTVRA	837		The information throughout the DEIS regarding wildlife appear to be based on one side and/or personal opinions biased against motorized recreation. There are studies available showing a man and his dog have as great or greater impact on wildlife than an OHV. While the chapter on general wildlife states the impacts are fairly equal, the DEIS focus is on eliminating only motorized opportunities. The DEIS does not offer specific information supporting the creation of more non-motorized areas for Grizzly Bear recovery.	Issues	There are studies available on the effects of recreation on wildlife. Most studies indicate a negative impact from motorized uses. There can also be negative effects from non-motorized use. Literature reviews appear in both the General Wildlife Issue and the Grizzly Bear Issue as well other issues. The DEIS focuses on balancing uses, not on eliminating motorized use. The FEIS offers specific information supporting the creation of more secure habitat for grizzly bears (see Grizzly Bear Issue).
Jim Barrett	Park County Environmental Council	881	Livingston	Lionhead should be protected from motorized use b/c it is an important wildlife corridor between YNP, the Continental Divide and wilderness areas in the Madison Range	Lionhead	The Lionhead TPA was analyzed as a wildlife corridor in the Biodiversity Issue, and additional analysis of this area appears in the Grizzly Bear Issue in Henry's Lake #2 subunit and Sheep/Mile Creek are outside of the Recovery Zone.
Bob Ebinger/ Robin Hoggan Ebinger		906	Livingston	Lionhead should be protected from motorized use b/c it is an important wildlife corridor between YNP, the Continental Divide and wilderness areas in the Madison Range	Lionhead	The Lionhead TPA was analyzed as a wildlife corridor in the Biodiversity Issue, and additional analysis of this area appears in the Grizzly Bear Issue in Henry's Lake #2 subunit and Sheep/Mile Creek are outside of the Recovery Zone.
Joan Bailey		1000	Portland OR	The Lionhead is an important wildlife corridor between YNP, the Continental Divide and wilderness areas w/in the Madison Range. It must be protected from motorized use.	Lionhead	The Lionhead TPA was analyzed as a wildlife corridor in the Biodiversity Issue, and additional analysis of this area appears in the Grizzly Bear Issue in Henry's Lake #2 subunit and Sheep/Mile Creek are outside of the Recovery Zone.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
James Brown		894	Livingston	The DEIS does not offer scientific information supporting the creation of more non-motorized areas for grizzly bear recovery.	Monitoring	See the Grizzly Bear Issue for information supporting the creation of more secure habitat for grizzly bears. Specifically, the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy lists 3 subunits 'in need of improvement' (Gallatin #3, Madison #2 and Henry's Lake #2). This means that the secure habitat within these subunits should be increased and motorized route density decreased. In addition, the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy states that there should be no decrease in secure habitat from the levels that existed in 1998.
Tom Pick		12		I urge the USFS and Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks to collectively look at ways to reduce the impact of OHVs on natural resources and the hunting experience. This argument is not about providing reasonable access or about wilderness versus multiple uses. It's about the economics of big business lobbies, lazy habits, and loose scruples overriding responsible natural resource management and upholding ethical standards of fair chase hunting.	Motorized (General)	Page 1-4 of the FEIS identifies 6 purposes for establishing a travel management plan for the Gallatin National Forest. Objective #3 is to establish objectives and/or restrictions to correct any unacceptable resource damage that is occurring due to the use of Forest roads, trails and areas open to cross-country travel. The ROD will provide a discussion on how resource issues influenced the final decision.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The Gallatin Crest - Porcupine TPAs have the potential to provide unfragmented habitat and north-south connectivity in an area largely surrounded by the heavily fragmented by motorized routes of the Gallatin Roaded and Tom Miner Rock TPAs. This potential can be met by the removal of motorcycles from Windy Pass Trail #82, NW Gallatin Trails, Gallatin Crest Trail in its entirety, East Fork Hyalite #434, Hyalite #427, Porcupine Buffalo Core Trails #1, 199, 466, Porcupine Creek Trail #34, Teepee Creek #39, Hidden Lake Divide Trail #66 south, Wilson Draw Trail #161 in the WSA. Same for mule deer, bighorn sheep and grizzly bears.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	This area of the Gallatin Crest-Porcupine has had a major reduction in motorized routes in Alternative 7M. Although motorized use has the potential to disrupt movement corridors, this area has a great deal of non-motorized habitat and fairly low use on some routes. In addition, some routes are open only to motorcycles for about 1 and 1/2 months of the year, and they are difficult enough riding that they probably will not get much use. Much of the eastern side and the southern part of the Gallatin Crest allows little motorized use.
Pat Simmons	Sierra Club	1545		The snowmobile season remains open until 1 June in too many areas. There are very few areas that will support staying open that late. We believe that a better closing date I 1 April with few exceptions. April 1 would also accommodate emerging grizzly bears that come out of their dens prior to June 1.	Snowmobiles	The grizzly bear/snowmobile issue was addressed more thoroughly in the Grizzly Bear Issue in the Final EIS. Please refer to that location.
Bob Roadarmel		345		From reading the DEIS, there is just speculation on how snowmobiles "could" impact the wildlife, not "how" they impact them. Isn't that what the DEIS was to be fore, to determine exact yes's and no's on	Snowmobiles	The purpose of the DEIS is not to conduct research but to determine effects based on what information exists and what is in available in the scientific literature. For example, there is not solid evidence that snowmobiles

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the accusations brought against OHVs?		affect denning or emerging grizzly bears, however, it is possible that snowmobiles could have an effect on sows with cubs-of-the-year in the spring. This part of the Grizzly Bear issue was addressed more thoroughly in the Final EIS.
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	619a		The DEIS listed some additional options to be considered in this Travel Planning process and many have merit; MWF would encourage the Forest to incorporate the following options as quoted in the final Travel Plan. Additional Option #1) - Add forest-wide goals and objectives for Grizzly bear conservation to meet the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy and close roads where protections are evaluated at less than 70% of the ideal. Guideline: Prioritize motorized route closures such that any motorized routes found to exist in secure grizzly bear habitat are physically closed as soon as possible, and before other non-emergency closures on the Forest.	Standards and Guidelines	A number of goals, objectives, etc. have been added to the Travel Plan that should be the same or very similar to those in the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy and the Grizzly Bear Amendment to the GYA Forest Plans in Alternatives 2-6. Alternative 7M states that the Forest will follow current direction for the grizzly bear and allows for that to change to match the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy. The 70% secure area has been found to be a figure that will not work for some subunits, and may not even be desirable where there is high risk of human/bear conflict (see Grizzly Bear Issue Madison #2 subunit). The average percent secure habitat by subunit in the GYA is very high due to the Wilderness Areas and non-motorized areas of Yellowstone National park. However, for areas adjacent to communities with private land within the National Forest and other road jurisdictions, it has not been possible to reach this percent secure in all subunits. This Travel plan either maintains or improves the percent secure habitat in all subunits with implementation of any of the action alternatives.
Ryan Molde		1436		Wapiti Creek has a dense population of grizzlies in the spring, when snow up high keeps them in the meadows. Some say these grizzlies are of exceptional size and more varied in color than most spots, and I have seen one unusual bear there. Someone that hikes the area much more than me has suggested that when the ski season closes, or thereabouts, the gate should be closed in snowmobile season ends as well. Access to the mountain is barred at that time, and maybe this could be no different.	Taylor Fork	The grizzly bear/snowmobile issue was addressed more thoroughly in the Grizzly Bear Issue in the Final EIS. Please refer to that section This comment is somewhat unclear, but many roads are closed in the spring to prevent road damage. Grizzly bears in the Yellowstone area are all genetically similar despite differences in appearance such as color.
Timothy L. Ravndal	Montana Multiple Use Association, Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1032		It is important that the following information be presented in the interest of NEPA disclosure, assurance that the Forest Plan standard is being followed and to add credibility to the statements and conclusions made about wildlife and habitat in the FEIS: A map which shows: Where and how dense	Maps	Maps and analysis which support wildlife effects determinations are available in the project record. Please see Chapter 3 for wildlife effects analysis.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the cover is within each of the analysis areas, how was the cover information obtained, what is the accuracy/confidence interval of the cover information and how current is the data. The map should also show the roads and display the miles used in the calculations in each of the analysis areas.		
Marlene Renwyck		496	Livingston	…we would like to see better signage at the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness boundary along trail systems. Occasionally we see mountain bike tracks past the wilderness boundary and oftentimes will notice that the sign for the Wilderness area is not accompanied by a sign explaining the associated restrictions. One such area that we have witnessed bike tracks in is the Suce Creek trail.	Absaroka Beartooth Wilderness	Thank you for your comment. Improving boundary signing is an ongoing project, as signs are often vandalized or removed.
Ron Nusbaum		1695	Absarokee	I just hiked into Martin Basin and followed a pack string out of the basin into the Theil Lake Valley. It was horrifying to believe that anyone would take horses on that trail - and an outfitter to boot. The trail from Theil Lake to Martin basin needs to be realigned or closed to animal travel - it is much too steep and dangerous. It is simply inhuman treatment of an animal to get it into such a place.	Absaroka Beartooth Wilderness	In the preferred alternative, this trail would be managed primarily for foot travel, travel by stock would be allowed but not encouraged. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
Alfred McGuire		25		ATVs should be restricted to the roads only. This will be the only way the 2 track erosion will be stopped.	ATVs	Alternatives 2-7M would all restrict ATV's to designated routes that are engineered and constructed to accommodate that vehicle type. Many of these routes would be old roads, some would be trails designed specifically to handle ATV travel.
Linda Ellison		1070		We also need to consider formalizing OHV and other access staging areas (especially in developing relatively "new" areas such as Bangtail, Wilson/Bear, and Deer Creeks) by constructing vault toilets or limiting camping to self-contained camping units. Campers that are not self-contained can be required to pack wastes out by using porta-potties or similar devices.	ATVs	We concur that some staging areas for motorized trail systems may need some improvements to adequately manage anticipated traffic. The travel plan decision is only designed to address what sorts of recreation use is appropriate on forest roads and trails, and does not specifically address trailhead improvements. These projects will be addressed under separate decisions after the travel plan decision is made.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Robb Larson		1391		The Forest Service should set an example in trail maintenance by not utilizing four wheelers to widen, straighten, or otherwise improve area trails. Many once-enjoyable single-track trails have been widened by the forest crews to 50" roads that encourage excessive use by motorized users. This methodology in turn gives some motorized users the impression that it is okay to forge their own new routes in a similar fashion. As a rule of thumb, any single-track trail in the entire region should be off-limits to all four-wheel use, including official use by forest service crews or contractors.	ATVs	We agree that administrative use of single track trails with motorized vehicles should be carefully managed. The travel plan decision will clearly articulate which routes are open to specific vehicle types, and any confusion about permissible vehicles will be dispelled.
Todd Orr		1473		Most ATV user-made trails were new route construction along ridge tops for scenic views, a hunting advantage or poaching single track trails.	ATVs	The travel plan preferred alternative articulated in Alternative 7M would designate all routes for future ATV use. User created routes that exist today that are not incorporated into the final decision as official trails would become off limits to motorized use.
Alex Phillips		1483a		I fully support the complete removal of ATVs from the entire WSA. The removal has been a long time in coming. I have seen the incredible damage those machines created in Rock Creek south. I am glad that they would be in large part removed from trails in the Bridgers. As I said before, it is crazy to allow them on any trail in the Crazy Mountains.	ATVs	The preferred Alternative 7M would prohibit ATVs on all routes within the HPBH. Several trails in the Fairy Lake travel planning area would be managed for ATVs - though the single track trails that are open to motorized use in the Bridgers are restricted to motorcycles only. Single track trails in the Crazies are also managed for only motorcycle travel or foot and stock use. Several ATV loops would be provided in the Shields. Please see the summer motorized map for Alternative 7M.
Craig Kenworthy		938	Bozeman	Do not open the Bangtail Divide trail #504 until 7/1 to motorcycles, rather than 6/15. Much of the trail is west facing and shaded; there are wet areas that could be eroded and damaged from early season use.	Bangtails	Alternative 7M would manage an open season for motorcycles on the Bangtail Divide Trail from June 15 - Oct. 15. In extra wet years, emergency closures may be employed until the trail is suitable for vehicle travel.
Richard Griffen		1080		The new Bangtail trail is fun but we lost a lot of great singletrack with all the logging in the Bangtails over the past 4 years - Old Stone Ck and White Pine/Moody Gulch. New trails should be constructed - with volunteer input and labor from the local mountain biking community.	Bangtails	Single track riding opportunities would continue to be provided on the Bangtail Divide Trail #504 in the preferred alternative. Most of the other trails in the Bangtails would be managed for ATVs and motorcycles. Nearby in the Bridgers, many of the open motorized routes are proposed to be managed for motorcycle use only. Please see the Alternative 7M summer motorized map
Jennifer Read		523	Bozeman	Additional motorized use encouraged by loop trails would create erosion, dust degradation of wildlife habitat, and compromise the GNF experience in the Bangtails for all nonmotorized users as well as	Bangtails	We recognize that there are different points of view about the merits of loop trails. We believe that loops provide a better recreation experience and that they discourage illegal off-route travel as compared to dead-

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				parking problems. The Jackson Creek access road is already a problem. The access road cuts across my land, causing problems with dust, noise and trash. Snowmobile and ATV trailers park on private land. Creating a parking lot at the edge of NF land is a good idea in theory. Public land begins about two miles up the Access Road and that would be a reasonable place to put a parking lot. The problem is the reality of snow and wind patterns in the winter. At a point about 1/8 mile form the GNF gate, the road drifts in and becomes impassable. A parking lot to accommodate snowmobile trailers 2 miles beyond that point would go unused. A parking lot on private land would be unacceptable to landowners. I would actively oppose the building of a parking lot on or adjacent to my property.		end routes. In regard to the Jackson Creek road and the inadequate parking situation the Bozeman Ranger District wants to continue working with you and recreation groups to resolve these problems.
Dennis B. Harms	Harms Livestock	664	Livingston	The proposed travel plan in Township 1 South, Range 8 East, Section 22 will have a huge negative impact on our private property. You are proposing the trail in Section 22, which comes along our private fence line. We currently have problems with the public cutting our fences and trespassing onto our private land in this area. We would like to suggest that the proposed trail along our fence line be abandoned and the trail stay on the existing logging road. I am also greatly concerned about the infestation of noxious weeds in the area.	Bangtails	The route shown is the location of the trail corridor. The trail will likely be located substantially away from the commentor's fenceline ands well within the National Forest. This should offer sufficient protection to the fenceline. It is hoped that by providing well-defined quality opportunities will reduce conflict with adjacent landowners and afford the Forest an easier opportunity to manage weeds along the trail and road system.
Paul Griffin	Gallatin Wildlife Association	707		Potential PFSRs for roads 480, 974, 977, 1706, 6600, 6944. completion and improvement of these roads could lead to housing/subdivision pressures on private land in the area. GWA opposes road improvement such as this in the Bangtails and other travel areas. In the face of increasing rural housing pressures and decreasing federal budgets, more and easier road access to areas close to Bozeman should not be encouraged.	Bangtails	Designation of Public Forest Service Roads or PFSR's allows the Forest Service to opportunity to provide a road standard that matches the use of the road and reduce annual maintenance. Most of the roads mentioned will only carry traffic during dry seasons, even though many of these roads are ask to provide yearlong private access. Most roads designated as PFSR are be used as many county roads by providing private land access.
Andy Copeland		1245		Create a trail to the BLM land at the south end of the Bangtail area for access from the Quinn Creek road. Manage it for non-motorized use.	Bangtails	No alternative considered constructing a new trail to access the BLM land near Quinn Ck. Managing trails on BLM land is outside of the scope of this project.
Clint patterson	North Fork LLC	841	Pray	Bangtails - parts of this proposed travel plan boarders property owned by North Fork LLC. Issues that should be looked at - weed control, trespassing on private property, littering, costs to build and	Bangtails	The Forest Service is responsible for road and trail management within the National Forest, and for maintenance on routes with forest service easements that provide public access across private land. County

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				maintain trails, costs and who will control and maintain all of above.		law enforcement would be responsible for addressing trespass issues on private land, as for any public road.
Connie Stafford		167		The general public needs to be kept off of Skunk Creek Road unless the road is brought up-to-date with many truckloads of gravel. If the roads were to be graveled the public should still be kept out from October 1st to June 31st.	Bangtails	The lower portion of the Skunk Creek road is proposed to be managed for passenger car vehicles, open year long to the end of private land east of Section 15. The road above that stretch would be closed to public vehicle travel from Dec. 2 - June 15. Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives.
Gary Weiner		1607		There is another major sediment problem at the southern end of this reach, just before the road/trail leaves Bear Creek, about 1 mile from the trailhead. This approx. tpp' section of road runs right up against the creek, contributing sediment-laden runoff directly to the creek. The road was cut across the base of a clay cliff, which is now over-steepened and mass-wasting onto the road and creek. However, a cutoff trail has been created in past years, running steeply up a ridge, then rejoining the road/trail in a few hundred feet, thereby by-passing the entire troublesome reach. By regrading and installing rolling water bars to properly handle runoff, this would be a preferred location for the trail.	Bear Canyon	We are aware of the sediment and route maintenance issues in Bear Creek, and are working actively with the State and County to address route location and maintenance issues. In the preferred alternative, all traffic on the Bear Canyon trail systems except for foot travel would be prohibited until the trail system can be "upgraded to a condition that alleviates sedimentation and water quality impacts from those facilities" (see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives - Standard 3-2 through 3-4 for Bear Canyon).
Kerry White		1616		Trail 440 is a loop trail and trail 458 gets you to the top where the towers are. These are easy trail and many people use this area. Motorized users have done a lot of maintenance in this area and MTVRA is working on some grant money to do some more. Maybe some rotational use in this area would accommodate different user types with less conflict.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M proposes to allow ATV and motorcycle use on trail 440 loops and a connector to the Goose Creek road system from July 15 - October 15, once these routes are reconstructed. Trail # 458 (Chestnut Mountain) would be closed to motorized use to protect an important wildlife corridor, and provide opportunities for non-motorized recreation.
Linda Ellison		1070		New World should remain open to trail motorcycle use. There is an unmarked remnant of an old trail that takes off to the east (probably I Sec.. 13) (before you reach the snow gauge station) that allows motorized use to stay completely out of the watershed area. It comes back into Trail 53 someplace in Sec. 28 or 29 west and south Bear Lakes. It is an easy skill level route that was used before the flood damage to New World occurred in the 1980s. It fell into disuse at that time, because, for a time, riders could not reach it, but should be evaluated for addition to the designated trail system as it would serve to disperse use along the main Bear Canyon route by giving motorcyclists another	Bear Canyon	No alternative considered managing the trail system within New World Gulch for motorized uses. This trail bisects State lands that are managed for non-motorized recreation opportunities.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				route by which to reach Bear Lakes and would decrease contacts with other users who are now exposed to riders having to go both up and back on the same trail.		
Linda Ellison		1070		Bear Canyon is appropriately designated for motorized use. It makes a nice after supper run on a summer evening. Trails in the area are easy in nature so it's a good place to take beginning riders, which is also good to have close to town. It provides a small fishery that is historically important to motorized recreationists as well.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M would manage the 440 loop trail system (including access to Bear Lakes on trail 53) in Bear Canyon as open to ATVs and motorcycles from July 15 through October 15, once the trail is reconstructed.
Richard Griffen		1080	Bozeman	Mnt. Bikes & Motorcycles - More loop trails need to be developed near Bozeman - a loop over Mt. Ellis from Sourdough to Triple tree, or Mt. Ellis Road would be good.	Bear Canyon	We agree that loop opportunities need to be provided for single track riding close to Bozeman. However, the routes you suggest are on State and private land, and outside of the scope of this decision.
Ted Lange		1094		Bear Canyon is such a trashed mud-pit that I haven't the slightest interest in ever hiking it, and the only reason I endure it on my bike is to get to some of the great riding further along the loop. If there is ever any way to get a mt bike friendly trail up out of Bear Canyon that would be truly wonderful - maybe something branching east off the New World Gulch trail in its first mile and contouring around and up to hit the ridge to the NW of TR438. That way it would never touch the motorized mess of Bear Canyon and perhaps the motorized users wouldn't use it enough to trash it.	Bear Canyon	We agree that loop opportunities need to be provided for single track riding close to Bozeman. However, the routes you suggest are on State and private land, and outside of the scope of this decision.
Kirk Hewitt		1334	Belgrade	Bear Lakes trail 53: both trails 53 and the proposed Bear Canyon West Pine connector should remain open to motorized use to provide a looping opportunity in an area that is already historically motorized use friendly.	Bear Canyon	In the preferred alternative, Trail 53 would be open to motorized use as far as Bear Lake. The connector route to West Pine would be managed for foot and stock use only, to preserve wilderness character within the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Trail Creek Trail 437: this trail should continue to provide a motorized use access to the Bear Canyon area from the Trail Creek Road. It also provides an emergency escape route if needed from the Bear Canyon side.	Bear Canyon	Alternatives 1-6 considered managing trail 437 for motorized use. Alternative 7M would manage this route for foot and stock use, to provide non-motorized recreation access to the Trail Creek Cabin. Motorized access is provided from Bear Canyon and the Goose Creek Road to this area.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Chestnut Mountain Trail 458: this trail goes from a Junction on trail for 440 to its end on Chestnut Ridge. A proposed trail from this ending point north to Trail Creek Road would add another looping opportunity to the Bear Canyon area.	Bear Canyon	No alternative considered the configuration you propose. The Chestnut Mountain area and trail provide valuable wildlife connections between the Gallatin Range and the Bridgers, therefore this area is proposed to be managed for non-motorized uses.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Bear Canyon/West Pine connector: this trail in combination with the Bear Lakes Trail number 53, (provided motorized use remains open) would create another motorized loop opportunity.	Bear Canyon	In the preferred alternative, Trail 53 would be open to motorized use as far as Bear Lake. The connector route to West Pine would be managed for foot and stock use only, to preserve wilderness character within the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Chestnut Mountain Trail extension: an extension of trail for 582 the Trail Creek Road would provide an excellent looping opportunity in an area that is historically motorized use oriented.	Bear Canyon	No alternative considered the configuration you propose. The Chestnut Mountain area and trail provide valuable wildlife connections between the Gallatin Range and the Bridgers, therefore this area is proposed to be managed for non-motorized uses.
Kathryn Hiestand and Neal Miller		337		We are highly disappointed that the preferred alternative would still allow motorized vehicles in the Bear Canyon. We strongly urge that Bear Canyon have restrictions on all motorized vehicles year round. The area has been abused through the years and needs a break from motorized abuse.	Bear Canyon	We realize that the travel plan preferred alternative in Bear Canyon is highly contentious and many people may not agree with continuing to provide motorized recreation opportunities in this area. We feel the area, with appropriate trail investments and management, can continue to support some historic motorized opportunities, and provide important short afternoon and evening ride opportunities close to Bozeman. Alternative 7M would manage the 440 loop trail and trail 53 to Bear Lake as open to ATVs and motorcycles from July 15 - October 15. Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for Bear Canyon for specific standards designed to protect soil and water resources associated with the proposed trail system.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301		Bear Canyon: motorized recreation has cause serious damage to the soils and vegetation in the area and has impacted local landowners who live in Bear Canyon. We believe the narrow creek bottoms up Bear Canyon simply cannot handle the level of motorized use in the area. Further, we think locating a motorized trailhead in a residential neighborhood is not acceptable.	Bear Canyon	We realize that the travel plan preferred alternative in Bear Canyon is highly contentious and many people may not agree with continuing to provide motorized recreation opportunities in this area. We feel the area, with appropriate trail investments and management, can continue to support some historic motorized opportunities, and provide important short afternoon and evening ride opportunities close to Bozeman. Alternative 7M would manage the 440 loop trail and trail 53 to Bear Lake as open to ATVs and motorcycles from July 15 - October 15. We are aware of the sediment and route maintenance issues in Bear Creek, and are working actively with the State and County to address route location and maintenance issues. In the preferred alternative, all traffic on the Bear Canyon trail systems except for foot travel would be prohibited until the trail system can be "upgraded to a condition that alleviates sedimentation and water quality impacts from those facilities" (see the Detailed Description of the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Alternatives - Standard 3-2 through 3-4 for Bear Canyon).Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for Bear Canyon for specific standards designed to protect soil and water resources associated with the proposed trail system.
Kathryn Hiestand and Neal Miller		337		We are highly disappointed that the preferred alternative would still allow motorized vehicles in the Bear Canyon. We strongly urge that Bear Canyon have restrictions on all motorized vehicles year round. The area has been a be used through the years and needs a break from motorized abuse.	Bear Canyon	We realize that the travel plan preferred alternative in Bear Canyon is highly contentious and many people may not agree with continuing to provide motorized recreation opportunities in this area. We feel the area, with appropriate trail investments and management, can continue to support some historic motorized opportunities, and provide important short afternoon and evening ride opportunities close to Bozeman. Alternative 7M would manage the 440 loop trail and trail 53 to Bear Lake as open to ATVs and motorcycles from July 15 - October 15. We are aware of the sediment and route maintenance issues in Bear Creek, and are working actively with the State and County to address route location and maintenance issues. In the preferred alternative, all traffic on the Bear Canyon trail systems except for foot travel would be prohibited until the trail system can be "upgraded to a condition that alleviates sedimentation and water quality impacts from those facilities" (see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives - Standard 3-2 through 3-4 for Bear Canyon).Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for Bear Canyon for specific standards designed to protect soil and water resources associated with the proposed trail system.
Patricia Brandon		739	Livingston	Bear Canyon Trail 458 should be opened to motorcycles and four wheelers. It is already on a road so what does it hurt.	Bear Canyon	The preferred alternative would manage this trail as non-motorized. The Chestnut Mountain area and trail provide valuable wildlife connections between the Gallatin Range and the Bridgers, therefore this area is proposed to be managed for non-motorized uses to maintain wildlife habitat security.
David King		755	Bozeman	I would hope that motorized access in the wintertime would be restricted for four wheelers. I have been in many areas where a snowmobiles track is nice to follow on skis, Eddie four Wheeler track is terrible! Early-season and increasingly into middle and even late season, four wheelers are in the mountains working their way through the snow. On a trail it is terrible! The tracks are too wide to have one ski and	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M proposes to manage the first several miles of Bear Canyon 440 trail as a marked xc ski trail (from the Bear Canyon Trailhead to the loop trail junction) closed to snowmobiles. The upper portions of the loop trail would be managed for both cross country skiers and for snowmobiles. Proposed standard A-10 would prohibit wheeled vehicles from traveling on groomed or marked snowmobile or ski trails from Dec. 1

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				each track and the center pump is too narrow to have both skis. It absolutely ruins the experience. Please keep four wheelers out of Bear Canyon when there is snow on the ground.		- April 15 annually.
Jenny McCune	Gallatin Valley Bicycle Club	762		Bear Canyon-if the Forest Service elects to keep this area open to motorized travel and goes ahead with its rehabilitation plans for the trail system - particularly loop trail for 440 - I ask that mountain bikes not be restricted during the rehabilitation phase. We did not cause the damage. Where the trail is heavily damaged we have to walk anyway so I feel that banning us during the rehabilitation would serve no purpose and would be punishing a user group for damage it didn't cause or helped to create.	Bear Canyon	Thank you for your comment. We feel it will be necessary during the rehabilitation phase of this trail system to prohibit all travel except foot travel in order to protect the newly reconstructed trail system. Once the system has "healed" it would be opened back up to mountain bikes. The preferred alternative would continue to seasonally restrict mountain bike and stock travel in wet periods during the spring from April 1 - July 15 once the trail is rebuilt.
Mary Sadowski		773	Bozeman	Bear Canyon - choose Goose Creek as the sole motorized access. This would reduce impact and degradation to the environment, better utilize resources, reduce residential complex, reduce conflicts created with New World Gulch nonmotorized access, provide greater capacity at New World Gulch parking area and at Goose Creek, minimize the need for multi-agency jurisdiction, reduce traffic violations, reduce violations on DNRC lands, and create a wildlife corridor.	Bear Canyon	This configuration was considered in alternative 4. We realize that the travel plan preferred alternative in Bear Canyon is highly contentious and many people may not agree with continuing to provide motorized recreation opportunities in this area. We feel the area, with appropriate trail investments and management, can continue to support some historic motorized opportunities, and provide important short afternoon and evening ride opportunities close to Bozeman. Alternative 7M would manage the 440 loop trail and trail 53 to Bear Lake as open to ATVs and motorcycles from July 15 - October 15. We are aware of the sediment and route maintenance issues in Bear Creek, and are working actively with the State and County to address route location and maintenance issues. In the preferred alternative, all traffic on the Bear Canyon trail systems except for foot travel would be prohibited until the trail system can be "upgraded to a condition that alleviates sedimentation and water quality impacts from those facilities" (see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives - Standard 3-2 through 3-4 for Bear Canyon).Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for Bear Canyon for specific standards designed to protect soil and water resources associated with the proposed trail system.
Mary Sadowski		773		The increasing number of motorized recreationists visiting Bear Canyon has generated additional and serious safety issues on the road. The volume of residential traffic and the particulars of this road	Bear Canyon	Jonathan……. The Gallatin NF does not have jurisdiction over regulating traffic on public roads outside of the National Forest. We have worked closely with the County, the Bear Canyon Task Force, and the State and

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				create cumulative impacts that the Forest Service is responsible for addressing along with the county.		considered all the trade offs and differing opinions when developing the final proposal for Bear Canyon. In an effort separate from the Travel Plan, the group mentioned above is working to resolve problems with the old County Road above the current parking area and the trailhead facility. Please see the Record of Decision for more discussion on the rationale for the decision..
Bruce Kron		1376	Livingston	The Bear Lakes Trail # 53 must be kept open as it is for motorized use. It is close to town and helps disperse use. I have ridden and hunted here many times over the past decades and hope to in the future.	Bear Canyon	This trail to the lake would remain open to ATVs and motorcycles in the preferred alternative.
Francis Noel		1461	Bozeman	Since the FS has constructed a road up Goose Creek to the Trail Creek Dabin, why not let this be the motorized access point instead of Bear Canyon? For the sake of our neighborhood and in the interest of reducing conflict among user groups why not spread them out. Most of the hikers/walkers, many with children and dogs, only go up the Bear Canyon Trail a mile or two before turning around. In most cases they would never encounter any motorized users.	Bear Canyon	This configuration was considered in alternative 4. We realize that the travel plan preferred alternative in Bear Canyon is highly contentious and many people may not agree with continuing to provide motorized recreation opportunities in this area. We feel the area, with appropriate trail investments and management, can continue to support some historic motorized opportunities, and provide important short afternoon and evening ride opportunities close to Bozeman. Alternative 7M would manage the 440 loop trail and trail 53 to Bear Lake as open to ATVs and motorcycles from July 15 - October 15. We are aware of the sediment and route maintenance issues in Bear Creek, and are working actively with the State and County to address route location and maintenance issues. In the preferred alternative, all traffic on the Bear Canyon trail systems except for foot travel would be prohibited until the trail system can be "upgraded to a condition that alleviates sedimentation and water quality impacts from those facilities" (see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives - Standard 3-2 through 3-4 for Bear Canyon).Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for Bear Canyon for specific standards designed to protect soil and water resources associated with the proposed trail system.
Alex Phillips		1483a		I don't agree with the removal of mountain bikes from Bear Canyon. It does not seem that they are doing the damage, but it is impossible to tell. What about removing motorized than monitoring it and see in the next couple of summers what damage is truly mountain bikers fault. If there really is damage then	Bear Canyon	In the preferred alternative, mountain bikes would be an emphasized use on the Bear Canyon trails. We feel it will be necessary during the rehabilitation phase of this trail system to prohibit all travel except foot travel in order to protect the newly reconstructed trail system. Once the system has "healed" it would be opened back

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				close it to mountain bikes too.		up to mountain bikes. The preferred alternative would continue to seasonally restrict mountain bike and stock travel in wet periods during the spring from April 1 - July 15 once the trail is rebuilt.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		We were told that when Bear Canyon was closed to full sized vehicles that it was done to allow the trail to be fixed/stabilized, then there was a good possibility it could be reopened. It remains closed today which is almost always the case, when once closed, a trail is closed forever. It is time that that trail be reopened after it has been closed.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M would manage the 440 loop trail system (including access to Bear Lakes on trail 53) in Bear Canyon as open to ATVs and motorcycles from July 15 through October 15, once the trail is reconstructed.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		A route from Bear Canyon all the way to Ennis was once opened to 4x4 use. We request that this or some similar route be established in order to provide a balance of recreation opportunities and to avoid complete loss of 4x4 recreational opportunities.	Bear Canyon	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		There is an illegal user-created/user-built trail that goes from Bear Canyon Loop #440 to #53. This route has been maintained in violation of 36 CFR 261.10.	Bear Canyon	The travel plan decision will manage all future motorized trail use on designated routes. All off route travel in the future will be in violation of 36 CFR 261, and handled through a combination of enforcement presence, rehabilitating user created routes, and education..
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		Trail #53 continues on into Bozeman Creek, the city watershed, and has become heavily used by ATVs at least to the divide, making trespass into the city watershed easy and highly likely. This illegal trail must be closed.	Bear Canyon	The preferred alternative would only allow motorized use of trail 53 to Bear Lakes. Travel west of the lake would be limited to foot, stock or mountain bikes on trail 53.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		Trail #458 up Chestnut Mountain is open to ATVs and motorcycles in every alternative as well, but makes a spectacular and very accessible hiking, horseback riding and mountain biking trail.	Bear Canyon	Trail # 458 (Chestnut Mountain) would be closed to motorized use to protect an important wildlife corridor, and provide opportunities for non-motorized recreation in the preferred alternative.
Thomas B. Wells		553		Goal 1B: This area is right for multiple use but the damage from motorized, particularly ATVs is so extensive in this area that motorized users should lose the right to use it. Either motorized users should raise the money to repair the damage and upgrade the road or they should be kept off.	Bear Canyon	We realize that the travel plan preferred alternative in Bear Canyon is highly contentious and many people may not agree with continuing to provide motorized recreation opportunities in this area. We feel the area, with appropriate trail investments and management, can continue to support some historic motorized opportunities, and provide important short afternoon and evening ride opportunities close to Bozeman. Alternative

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						7M would manage the 440 loop trail and trail 53 to Bear Lake as open to ATVs and motorcycles from July 15 - October 15. We are aware of the sediment and route maintenance issues in Bear Creek, and are working actively with the State and County to address route location and maintenance issues. In the preferred alternative, all traffic on the Bear Canyon trail systems except for foot travel would be prohibited until the trail system can be "upgraded to a condition that alleviates sedimentation and water quality impacts from those facilities" (see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives - Standard 3-2 through 3-4 for Bear Canyon).Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for Bear Canyon for specific standards designed to protect soil and water resources associated with the proposed trail system.
Paul Griffin	Gallatin Wildlife Association	707		Bear Lakes Trail #53 to Bozeman Creek Divide - Endorse year long closure to ATVs and motorcycles because of illegal motorized use along Bozeman Creek Divide.	Bear Canyon	The preferred alternative would only allow motorized use of trail 53 to Bear Lakes. Travel west of the lake (to the Bozeman Ck. divide) would be limited to foot, stock or mountain bikes on trail 53.
Kathryn Hiestand and Neal Miller		337	Bozeman	We are highly disappointed that the preferred alternative would still allow motorized vehicles in Bear Canyon. We strongly urge that Bear Canyon have restrictions on all motorized vehicles year-round. The area has been abused through the years and needs a break from motorized abuse.	Bear Canyon	We realize that the travel plan preferred alternative in Bear Canyon is highly contentious and many people may not agree with continuing to provide motorized recreation opportunities in this area. We feel the area, with appropriate trail investments and management, can continue to support some historic motorized opportunities, and provide important short afternoon and evening ride opportunities close to Bozeman. Alternative 7M would manage the 440 loop trail and trail 53 to Bear Lake as open to ATVs and motorcycles from July 15 - October 15. We are aware of the sediment and route maintenance issues in Bear Creek, and are working actively with the State and County to address route location and maintenance issues. In the preferred alternative, all traffic on the Bear Canyon trail systems except for foot travel would be prohibited until the trail system can be "upgraded to a condition that alleviates sedimentation and water quality impacts from those facilities" (see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives - Standard 3-2 through 3-4 for Bear Canyon).Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for Bear Canyon for specific standards designed to protect soil and water resources associated

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						with the proposed trail system.
Loren Blanksma		1194		Also, the Trail Creek trail (437) should remain open to motorcycles to provide a loop opportunity from Bear Canyon to Trail Creek road. The other road (Goose Creek 1005) and trails (Bear Loop 440, Goose Creek Cutoff 459) should remain open to motorized use as indicated in Alt 7.	Bear Canyon	Alternatives 1-6 considered managing trail 437 for motorized use. Alternative 7M would manage this route for foot and stock use, to provide non-motorized recreation access to the Trail Creek Cabin. Motorized access is provided from Bear Canyon and the Goose Creek Road to this area.
Andy Copeland		1245	Bozeman	Bear Canyon/West Pine Connector - when separate areas and loop scan be connected, the whole becomes greater than the sum of its parts. Mountain bikes need connections between southern routes and the areas to the north, as well as between Yellowstone -side access points and the crest.	Bear Canyon	We agree that providing loop opportunties is preferable. In the preferred alternative 7M the connector route to West Pine would be managed for foot and stock use only, to preserve wilderness character within the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area in keeping with legal mandates and Forest Service policy.
Andy Copeland		1245		Allow mountain biking to continue on these trails while they are being upgraded. Mountain bikes can't actually ride in the badly damaged section of 440. The ruts are too deep, the mud bogs too muddy. While mountain biking does impact trails, the level of damage is much closer to that of hikers.	Bear Canyon	Thank you for your comment. We feel it will be necessary during the rehabilitation phase of this trail system to prohibit all travel except foot travel in order to protect the newly reconstructed trail system. Once the system has "healed" it would be opened back up to mountain bikes. The preferred alternative would continue to seasonally restrict mountain bike and stock travel in wet periods during the spring from April 1 - July 15 once the trail is rebuilt.
Todd Orr		840		437 - Trail Creek to Trail Creek Cabin - suggest managing as open to motorized use and loop trail in a very motorized area.	Bear Canyon	Alternatives 1-6 considered managing trail 437 for motorized use. Alternative 7M would manage this route for foot and stock use, to provide non-motorized recreation access to the Trail Creek Cabin. Motorized access is provided from Bear Canyon and the Goose Creek Road to this area.
Todd Orr		840		440 - Bear Canyon Loop Trail - suggest managing as open to motorized use and loop trail in a very motorized area. Extensive trail maintenance is needed however.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M would manage the 440 loop trail system (including access to Bear Lakes on trail 53) in Bear Canyon as open to ATVs and motorcycles from July 15 through October 15, once the trail is reconstructed.
Todd Orr		840		53 - Bear lake and Mystic Lake Trail - suggest managing as open to motorized use and loop trail in a very motorized area. Extensive trail maintenance is needed however. Better signing is needed at Bozeman Creek divide.	Bear Canyon	The preferred alternative would only allow motorized use of trail 53 to Bear Lakes. Travel west of the lake (to the Bozeman Ck. divide) would be limited to foot, stock or mountain bikes on trail 53 to provide opportunities for non-motorized recreation.
Todd Orr		840		458 - Chestnut Mountain - suggest managing as open to motorized use and loop trail in a very motorized area. Extensive trail maintenance is needed however.	Bear Canyon	Trail # 458 (Chestnut Mountain) would be closed to motorized use in the preferred alternative to protect an important wildlife corridor, and provide opportunities for non-motorized recreation in the preferred alternative.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Todd Orr		840		459 - Chestnut Mountain to Goose Creek - suggest managing as open to motorized use and loop trail in a very motorized area. Extensive trail maintenance is needed however.	Bear Canyon	Trail # 458 (Chestnut Mountain) would be closed to motorized use in the preferred alternative to protect an important wildlife corridor, and provide opportunities for non-motorized recreation in the preferred alternative.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	For much of its length Bear Canyon is narrow with Bear Creek running through the bottom in a lush riparian area. There are at least 3 river crossings that vehicle traffic has severely damaged in the first 2 miles of trail #440. ATVs and motorcycles spread noxious weed seeds faster that non-motorized travelers.	Bear Canyon	We realize that the travel plan preferred alternative in Bear Canyon is highly contentious and many people may not agree with continuing to provide motorized recreation opportunities in this area. We feel the area, with appropriate trail investments and management, can continue to support some historic motorized opportunities, and provide important short afternoon and evening ride opportunities close to Bozeman. Alternative 7M would manage the 440 loop trail and trail 53 to Bear Lake as open to ATVs and motorcycles from July 15 - October 15. We are aware of the sediment and route maintenance issues in Bear Creek, and are working actively with the State and County to address route location and maintenance issues. In the preferred alternative, all traffic on the Bear Canyon trail systems except for foot travel would be prohibited until the trail system can be "upgraded to a condition that alleviates sedimentation and water quality impacts from those facilities" (see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives - Standard 3-2 through 3-4 for Bear Canyon).Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for Bear Canyon for specific standards designed to protect soil and water resources associated with the proposed trail system.
Dean and Madelein Bladow		1191	Cooke City	We strongly oppose the closure/decommissioning of Goose Lake Road #3230 Seg 2. This road is important access to fishing lakes, to wilderness trailheads, and to backcountry scenery. It is important recreation access road. We recommended seasonal use by the same as seg 1 as recommended in this letter.	Bear Canyon	Goose Creek road segment two would be managed as a motorcycle and ATV trail under the preferred alternative.
Scott and Deborah Brown		220	Bozeman	Speed limits are not obeyed in the canyon which should be a safety issue for the school area and all of us who drive the road Dailey.	Bear Canyon	We understand that recreationists accessing National Forest use the county road for that access, and may contribute to speeding violations, but travel on county roads outside of the Forest is not within our jurisdiction to control, and is outside the scope of this decision.
Scott and Deborah Brown		220	Bozeman	Parking at the top of the canyon is really inappropriate for the increased numbers of people which arrive. The home owners there are faced with	Bear Canyon	The parking facility for the New World Gulch trails and Bear Canyon trail 440 is located off of the Gallatin NF and is outside of our jurisdiction. The Forest Service,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				hundreds of people through the year parking very near their homes and drives.		Bear Canyon homeowners, the County and State are all working toward other solutions outside of the travel planning process to address homeowner concerns relative to parking at the of the public road.
Mike Menzel		244	Edina, MN	Regarding the proposal the Gallatin National Forest in support Alternative 2 and in addition I oppose the creation of a new loop connecting the Goose Creek trail with the Henderson MT/Sheep Trail system.	Bear Canyon	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Jenny McCune	Gallatin Valley Bicycle Club	762	Bozeman	I can attest to the fragile nature of the soil (high clay content) and the existing trail damage and problems with motorized traffic off-road. Having discussed the rehabilitation of these trails to make them impervious to motorized use, I understand that this can be done. I believe the cost is high and isn't fair to the majority of users who do not use ATVs and motorcycles. Why should tax payers front the bill for them?	Bear Canyon	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Gary Weiner		1607		Rode ATVs with Kerry White on a 13.5 mile loop from the trailhead at the end of Bear Creek Road. Trail signage was at times challenging, and we missed a turn and did not ride one section of the loop trail. Most of what we saw is in good shape, with the exception of two areas: In the firs mile of road/trail, there are 3 creek crossings that contribute sediment to the creek each time a vehicle uses them. The crossings have widened with use, and two of them have deepened as well, as the clay soils do not bear up well to heavy vehicle use. These crossings can be improved by narrowing them to match the normal channel width, then either hardening them with an application of rock or building timber bridges.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M would manage the 440 loop trail and trail 53 to Bear Lake as open to ATVs and motorcycles from July 15 - October 15, as well as a connector to Goose Creek/Trail Creek Cabin. We are aware of the sediment and route maintenance issues in Bear Creek, and are working actively with the State and County to address route location and maintenance issues. In the preferred alternative, all traffic on the Bear Canyon trail systems except for foot travel would be prohibited until the trail system can be "upgraded to a condition that alleviates sedimentation and water quality impacts from those facilities" (see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives - Standard 3-2 through 3-4 for Bear Canyon).Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for Bear Canyon for specific standards designed to protect soil and water resources associated with the proposed trail system.
Linda Ellison		1070		The Dean Gulch trail has been dropped from the current Travel Plan map (appearing as far back as	Bear Canyon	No alternative considers this proposal. The Dean Gulch area and Chestnut Mountain would be closed to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the 1977 map). It should be returned to the trail system and designated for motorcycle use. It also serves to disperse a portion of the traffic from the main route. Again, it's an easy route but adds variety to the experience.		motorized use in the preferred alternative to protect an important wildlife corridor, and provide opportunities for non-motorized recreation in the preferred alternative.
Gary Vodehnal	GVLT	815	Bozeman	Chestnut Mountain from a new trailhead on the south side of I-90 near the Trail Creek exit. This trail would cross an existing GVLT conservation easement, following an existing trail easement on land owned by Montana Outdoor Science School (MOSS). It would then climb up the slopes to the south, eventually joining the existing ridge trail on Chestnut Mountain. After leaving the MOSS property, the trail would cross a section of land currently owned by the Schmidt family that will be acquired by the Gallatin National Forest as part of the planned conservation transaction. Just south of the MOSS property boundary an additional spur trail would contour west to the base of a popular rock climbing area.	Bear Canyon	This connector trail from the I-90/trail creek corridor is proposed as a foot and stock trail in the preferred alternative.
Donald McAndrew		1027	Bozeman	Buck Ridge trail: if you opt for Alt 7 we will have a majority of the early morning snowmobile and 4-wheeler activity unloading and revving up to go up the trail.	Big Sky	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Rick Meis		1030	Bozeman	Buck Ridge: should be closed to all summer motorized use. With the problematic situation that has come to a head in Muddy Creek and McAtee Basin over the last few years I can see no viable alternative but a total closure of the area. Too many motorized users are ignoring the closure causing significant and noticeable resource damage.	Big Sky	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Muddy Creek trail #8 should be open to motorcycle use. It is the only access to get near cedar Lake.	Big Sky	In the preferred alternative Muddy Ck. Trail # 8 would be closed to motorcycles, to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities, and mitigate historic trespass and resource damage concerns. Allowing motorcycles

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						on this routes was considered in alternatives 2 and 3.
Rick Rambler		96	Belgrade	I can understand why the FS stopped pickups from driving on Buck Ridge but I do not understand how ATV use of Buck Ridge is significantly different from pickup use. Every year I see ATV tracks off of the Buck Ridge trail. There is significant ATV damage in the head of McAtee Basin and in Muddy Creek. ATVs should not be allowed on Buck Ridge for the same reasons that pickup use was prohibited years ago.	Big Sky	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Rick Rambler		96	Belgrade	Building a new trail to create a looped trail is not a good idea in this area. The proposed route will be steep in some areas which is not compatible with ATV use. ATVs cause significant damage on steep trails. The proposed location for the new trail will disturb wildlife because it goes through very good elk habitat. If you hunt you know that elk like side ridges. I know from experience that elk like the ridges that come off of Buck Ridge between the Yellow Mules. The north side of Flattop Mountain is security cover for elk. There is a trail on Flattop that the elk would use when they were pushed by other hunters. The ridge going down to Flattop and the ridge between the 2nd and 3rd Yellow Mules consistently had elk on them. The proposed trail goes right through these areas.	Big Sky	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		We discussed keeping Buck Creek Trail #174 open because it is so seldom used there will be virtually no impact by leaving it open.	Big Sky	The preferred alternative 7M would continue to manage trail 174 as closed to motorized use (as it is today). The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Mark Young		999	Bozeman	I have lived near the trailhead for Leverich Canyon and over the last 5 years the increased motorcycle and ATV traffic has caused significant erosion and	Bozeman Creek	In the preferred alternative, the Leverich Canyon trail would be managed for non-motorized uses only (foot, stock, and mountain bikes).

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the "new" trails where ATV and motorcycles have just taken off into the woods.		
Anne Goertzen		1015	Bozeman	Leverich Canyon: Motorbikes and ATVs have discovered this area and are now going up and down all 4 trails in this area. It is creating a lot of damage as the trails in this area are too steep and narrow for motorized use. It is also a very dangerous combination to have citizens hiking and running up the trail at the same time the motorbikes are barreling down.	Bozeman Creek	In the preferred alternative, the Leverich Canyon trail would be managed for non-motorized uses only (foot, stock, and mountain bikes).
Ted Lange		1094	Bozeman	I would be interested in seeing additional single track developed in the Mystic Lake drainage/City of Bozeman watershed where motorized use is strictly prohibited and therefore single track trails have a chance of remaining single track.	Bozeman Creek	The preferred alternative does identify a small new section of single track mountain bike trails in Bozeman Creek, to provide better loop connectors. Please see the summer non-motorized maps for alternative 7M.
Greg Beardslee		737		It would be good to rent or lease a parking spot down near Nash Road somewhere, so that the existing right-of-way road could become the new lower trail. Right now it's just a hard to reach party spot that impacts everyone living up there. Currently it is maintained so that people can burn palettes and dump trash. Gate it.	Bozeman Creek	The scope of the travel plan decision is confined to considering what the appropriate use of roads and trails will be. While we realize that new trailhead facilities may be desirable in some locations, those projects will be considered on a case by case basis at another time and are outside the scope of this decision.
Thomas B. Wells		553		New World Gulch Trail #50: This trail is poorly designed and in terrible condition. If it is used as a bike and stock emphasis trail, it will further erode. This trail should receive only foot traffic until it is repaired. At that time it should have seasonal bike and stock closures so that it does not receive damaging use until such time as it is thoroughly redesigned.	Bozeman Creek	Thank you for this comment about Trail #50. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
Greg Beardslee	Gallatin Ridge Riders Contact - Gallatin Valley Bicycle Club	1785		I proposed giving the ATVs a motorized trail further to the west. Leverich is an important access to the Moser/Lick area. Also I proposed closing the auto access to the trailhead to cut down on vandalism and vagrancy. People are living in their cars there, and still burning pallets. How about leasing a small	Bozeman Creek	The Leverich Canyon trail is proposed to be managed for foot, stock and mountain bike travel only in the preferred alternative 7M. The scope of the travel plan decision is confined to considering what the appropriate use of roads and trails will be. While we realize that new trailhead facilities may be desirable in some locations,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				parking area below the neighborhood along South 3rd? Or create some parallel parking along the road. The trailhead access and road condition is shameful. So let's use it as a trail instead.		those projects will be considered on a case by case basis at another time and are outside the scope of this decision.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The Leverich Canyon trail (435) should remain open to motorcycles as a convenient way for south side residents to access the Hyalite area through Moser Creek without congesting the Main Hyalite Road. This seems reasonable because the entire adjacent Bozeman Creek drainage is already non-motorized.	Bozeman Creek	Alternatives 1-6 considered managing Leverich for motorcycle access. The preferred alternative would manage this route for foot, stock and mountain bike travel only - to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities, and minimize conflicts on this popular route.
Andy Copeland		1245		Move the Leverich Canyon Trailhead "parking lot" down the canyon and close the upper part of the road to motor vehicles.	Bozeman Creek	The scope of the travel plan decision is confined to considering what the appropriate use of roads and trails will be. While we realize that new trailhead facilities may be desirable in some locations, those projects will be considered on a case by case basis at another time and are outside the scope of this decision.
Andy Copeland		1245		Create a trail route to Mount Ellis from the Bozeman Creek trail for mountain bikes.	Bozeman Creek	While this proposal has merit - the DEIS did not consider any new route connectors in this area for the public to comment on because we were not made aware of the proposal in time to add it to any alternative. Therefore this route is not considered in any alternative in the FEIS.
Marlene Renwyck		496	Livingston	From the North Cottonwood Trail south, both sides of the Bridgers should be closed to all motorized use. ...One day in particular we were almost run over by a dirt biker going way too fast downhill around a blind corner. …Finally, the Bridgers are becoming degraded from some of the motorized use due to illegal use by dirt bikers. Just one or two users going off the trail down a sub alpine meadow can leave a scar that takes years to heal.	Bridger Canyon	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The South Fork Brackett Creek road (631) must remain open to motorized use.	Bridger Canyon	In the preferred alternative, the South Brackett Creek road would provide the primary access to the Ross Pass summer trailhead, and would be open to passenger cars from May 31 - Dec. 2. This road would be closed to motorized use in the winter and managed as a xc ski trail.
Andy Copeland		1245		Create a connection along the southeast slope of Baldy Mtn. between the southern end of trail 538 and trail 534 (Bridger Foothills trail). This would add several access options to trail 538 and create an epic route for mountain biking. Currently there is no	Bridger Canyon	While this proposal has merit - the DEIS did not consider any new route connectors in this area for the public to comment on because we were not made aware of the proposal in time to add it to any alternative. Therefore this route is not considered in any alternative in the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				route connecting the east and west sides of the southern Bridgers.		FEIS. There are several existing connectors between the east and west side of the Bridgers further north (Ross Pass and trail 534 at Fairy Lake).
Mark Shyne		775		East side of the Bridgers: …leave Olson Creek road open, so we can get to the upper trail along the range there.	Bridger Canyon	The Olson Creek road would be managed as open to passenger cars from May 15 - Dec. 1 in all alternatives.
Mike Slevin		977	West Yellowstone	Reconsider closing the trail just short of Calm Creek. Closing it to ATVs would stop the possibility of many from enjoying the pristine cabin for a night of just to visit it.	Cabin Creek	The Lee Metcalf Wilderness Act (PL 98-140) articulated for the Cabin Ck. Recreation and Wildlife Management Area that the area be managed to "maintain presently existing wilderness character". Conversion of routes that were single track (all routes in the Cabin Ck. WMA except the Oil Well Road - Trail # 68) to double track ATV routes would have tangible effects to wilderness character circa 1983. The preferred alternative would not allow ATVs beyond the Cabin Ck. divide on trail 151, in order to maintain those characteristics described in the Act. See the roadless effects analysis in Chapter III in the FEIS.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Emphasizing motorcycle use on trail 401 is inconsistent with the management approach the Forest Service has taken in other parts of the forest where the private/public land ownership creates a checkerboard.	Cherry Creek	Please see the Record of Decision and the decision maps for final motorized configuration on the Cherry Creek Trail #401 and the rationale for that decision.
Kerry White		1616		We propose the opening of the Slough Creek Corridor by the enforcement of RS2477. This road has a long history of use and maintenance. The statue of limitations was removed from the law recently, the Counties of Park and Sweet Grass both adopted the road and therefore we believe that this road qualifies as public right of way and open seasonally. The proposal we have is summer multiple use open August and September, winter multiple use (trail only) January through May.	Cooke City	The Slough Creek corridor in located within the Absaroka Beartooth Wilderness, and is closed by law to motorized vehicles. No alternative considers allowing motorized use in the wilderness.
David Courtis		276	Washington	Miller Creek Road 3228: the onset of winter would seem to make closure of the road to high clearance, ATV and other motorized vehicles to be earlier than December 2. Perhaps October 15 would be more realistic? The road is impassable to normal passenger cars. It should be designated as P for them.	Cooke City	This route is proposed to be managed for 4x4 high clearance vehicles. Passenger cars would be allowed, but not encouraged. Fall travel would not be restricted (except by mother nature) until this route becomes part of the snowmobile trail system (wheeled vehicles would be prohibited after Dec. 2)
David Courtis		276		Kersey Lake Road 306: the remains of the road along trail 3 to the outlet to Kersey Lake should be obliterated.	Cooke City	Thank you for this suggestion. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads will be in the future, but does not generally

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						address current maintenance issues, or decommissioning/rehabilitation decisions. These projects will occur after the plan is finalized, with site specific project decisions supporting this work on a case-by-case basis. The final decision will designate all routes for summer motorized use, any routes not designated will no longer be open to summer motorized travel. The forest will be developing project lists for routes to decommission/restore in the near future.
David Courtis		276		Woody Creek Road 3221 and 1172: the ATV road that goes to the falls at Woody Creek and extends beyond to the northern boundary of the North Absoroka Wilderness area should the obliterated. Its continued existence negates the forest's plan to focus motorized recreation north of US Highway 212.	Cooke City	Thank you for this suggestion. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads will be in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues, or decommissioning/rehabilitation decisions. These projects will occur after the plan is finalized, with site specific project decisions supporting this work on a case-by-case basis. The final decision will designate all routes for summer motorized use, any routes not designated will no longer be open to summer motorized travel. The forest will be developing project lists for routes to decommission/restore in the near future.
Earl McNinch		293	Cooke City	Seasonal Road Closures: there should be seasonal closures on both the Goose Lake Jeep Trail and the Lake Abundance road. Motorized travel on these roads during early spring when snow banks still cover shady parts of the roads invite going around and off the road. This has caused damage and erosion problems in the past. The roads could be opened in sections as the snow melts. The success of these closures will require education, signage, and enforcement.	Cooke City	All the passenger car and 4x4 high clearance routes are proposed to be closed to vehicle travel from Dec. 2 - June 15. Off route travel will no longer be permissible once the travel plan decision is finalized.
Gary Weiner		995	Bozeman	Trespass, Rock Creek and Cottonwood trails are too steep to sustain motorized uses w/out severe and worsening erosion. If motorized uses are to continue in this area these trails must be rebuilt to withstand the impact.	East Crazies	The preferred alternative 7M would manage the Trespass trail for foot, stock and mountain bike travel only. The Cottonwood trail would be open to ATVs and motorcycles to the private land boundary in section 9 - on an old road. The Rock Ck. trail is proposed to be open to motorcycles, to the private land boundary in section 11 from June 15 - October 15. This trail would be maintained for motorcycle, foot and stock traffic.
David Strong		1574		The narrow valley and small cirque of Trespass Creek are just too confined for both foot and motorized traffic. Motorbikes have severely eroded this trail in the cirque and beyond where the trail	East Crazies	Trespass and Elk Creek trails are proposed to be managed for non-motorized uses in the preferred alternative.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				joins the Elk Creek Trail (a trail that has much loop potential for hikers). The Forest Service will not be able to prevent this horrendous erosion from happening unless they stop the motorized use of this area.		
David Strong		1574		Similarly, motorbikes have caused erosion on a very dangerous alpine section of the Sunlight Lake Trail near the divide. They need to be kept off this trail. Sunlight Lake itself is a sacred place that should not be damaged by the noise, smell, and signs of motorized traffic. Beginning at the Porcupine Trailhead and hiking to Campfire Lake (via Elk Creek Trail) and on to Sunlight Lake, returning to the Porcupine Trailhead makes one of the nicest loop trails in the lower 48.	East Crazies	The Sunlight trail would be managed for non-motorized uses in the preferred alternative, as would Elk Creek, and Sweetgrass Creek. The Porcupine Lowline connector trail #267 would be managed for foot, stock, and motorcycles between the Porcupine Cabin and the Sunlight trailhead. This trail would be open to motorcycles from June 15 - Sept. 15.
Charles M. Paden and Janis R. Bullock		1474a		We are disappointed that Cottonwood, Rock, and Trespass Creek areas in the West Crazies are not designated motor-free. They should be so year-round. The steep terrain in the upper portion of these drainages is particularly vulnerable to erosion damage from motorized use.	East Crazies	The preferred alternative 7M would manage the Trespass trail for foot, stock and mountain bike travel only. The Cottonwood trail would be open to ATVs and motorcycles to the private land boundary in section 9 - on an old road. The Rock Ck. trail is proposed to be open to motorcycles, to the private land boundary in section 11 from June 15 - October 15. This trail would be maintained for motorcycle, foot and stock traffic. In the winter, the preferred alternative would allow snowmobiles in the Trespass and Cottonwood drainages, but Rock Creek would be managed as non-motorized. Alternative 6 evaluated the configuration you propose in your comment.
Joseph Scalia III		635		Trespass Creek in the Crazies is even more vulnerable to damage. ORVs there have not only torn up the trail's tread all the way to its divide above Elk Creek, but motorcycles have ridden off the trails and into the fragile and moist meadows, ripping up the grasses and other flora and the soft and fertile soils in such a way that even if all ORV damage were to stop immediately it would take many years to recover. The damage to the trail cannot recover on its own and can only be stopped so as not to become even worse. This trail is in danger of becoming all but impassable to even the most accomplished and fit hikers.	East Crazies	The Trespass trail is proposed to be managed for non-motorized uses in the preferred alternative in the summer.
Rich Inman et al	Gallatin Valley Back Country	428a		Sunlight Trail: We recommend that you investigate the possibilities of building and maintaining a proper	East Crazies	The Sunlight trail would be managed for non motorized uses in the preferred alternative. Alternative 3

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Horsemen			trail in this area that might employ the multiple use sharing system.		considered managing this route for motorcycles to the Sunlight/Sweetgrass Divide. The preferred alternative would manage this route as non-motorized in summer and in winter to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		Carroll Creek Road is the longest new motorized route proposed for the Bridgers. Carroll Creek Road would not be opened until logging is finished there and all spur roads ripped and rehabilitated. Native Forest Network insists that those standards be met, at a minimum, before this route is open to motorized use.	Fairy Lake	In the preferred alternative 7M, parts of the Carroll Creek road system would be managed as ATV trails. A proposed guideline would provide the flexibility to keep this route closed until it meets applicable engineering guidelines for the proposed use. Please see Guideline A-12 in Chapter I of the Detailed Description of the Alternatives.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	You suggest # 500, the Fairy lake trail going south as an ATV trail. I don't think an ATV can get over it.	Fairy Lake	The travel planning process is designed to determine the "desired future condition" for different uses of roads and trails. We realize that many routes may not currently meet the engineering standards for the targeted vehicle or use. Some of the routes proposed for ATV use will need to be reconstructed for that use. A proposed guideline would provide the flexibility to keep this route closed until it meets applicable engineering guidelines for the proposed use. Please see Guideline A-12 in Chapter I of the Detailed Description of the Alternatives. The preferred alternative would manage trail #500 for ATV use.
Kerry White		1616		Number 551 connects to 534 and follows along the west side of the ridge. We need some rotational use on these trails so that clubs can get the maintenance done. We should utilize the motorized people to improve these trails because I think a lot more people would use this area if the trails were in better shape.	Fairy Lake	The preferred alternative would manage these routes for travel by motorcycles, foot, stock and mountain bikes. We are also considering a "time share" use of routes, where the wheeled vehicle traffic would be staggered with foot and stock travel during the open season in some way. Please see the Record of Decision for more discussion on the "time share" concept.
Kerry White		1616		Trail 525, 551, 500 and 540 have been identified by the county as open to motorized. These are heavy multiple use trails and the public should be aware of the uses in this area. These trails provide the only access to the east side of the Bridgers and it would be a crime to take them away from the motorized users or anyone else.	Fairy Lake	The Forest Service has jurisdiction and management responsibility for all National Forest System trails and roads on the Gallatin National Forest. The Forest Service has no information or evidence to indicate that Gallatin County has asserted rights to these or to any other National Forest System trail or road on the Gallatin National Forest. In the preferred alternative trails 500, and 551 would be managed for summer motorized uses, trails 525 and 540 would be managed for non-motorized recreation opportunities. Please see the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Duane Halverson		1309	Townsend	North's Bridgers East side: trailhead number 743 which runs alongside boundary line 500 that meets at trail number 74 at Fairy Lake Campground no longer exists. This is no longer assessable because of the private party who built the house in section 26, township 2, range seven East. This closure also includes trail number 1744.	Fairy Lake	The Travel Plan is a decision about uses allowed along a specified corridor. If repair or relocation of a trail is needed to accommodate the designated use, it can be proposed through future site-specific analysis under NEPA. In other words the current condition of the facility was not used as a reason to dis-allow use. Since the release of the DEIS the Brackett Creek land exchange was completed and the intent is to relocate the access and trailhead to avoid the new private land.
Duane Halverson		1309		Trail # 74 which begins near campground 1171 is also a occasionally closed off because of a gate at the highway or 2 miles up trail # 74 where there is another gate closure.	Fairy Lake	We assume the commentor is referring to the Fairy Lake Road #74. The Gate is indeed closed seasonally with gates in the two locations mentioned. The seasonal closures protect roadbeds during specific seasons as well as providing a winter motorized and non-motorized recreational opportunities.
Duane Halverson		1309		Trailhead 74 to 74 at Fairy Lake is no longer available except for cross country travel since you, in your divine wisdom, have locked down any motorized cross country travel on the ridge line of the north Bridgers down to boundary line 500-540.	Fairy Lake	Under Alternative 7-M a motorcycle connector route between Trail #500 and the west side of the Bridger Mountain Range would be provided via the Ross Pass Trail and a new connector route. See the ROD and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final decision and rationale for it.
Jean MacInnes	Bohart Ranch Cross-Country Ski Center	760		I am a little confused in relation to the information on the Middle Fork Bracket Creek Road 6948 in the Fairy Lake section as it does not seem to reflect of the land swap in the Bracket Creek area. This may be a separate issue and to be addressed later.	Fairy Lake	We apologize if the alternative maps for this area created confusion in light of the Brackett Creek land exchange. During the travel planning process, and up until the DEIS was released, the Brackett Creek land exchange was not yet complete and we believed it would be in appropropriate and pre-mature to reflect the route configuration as if it was. Shortly after release of the DEIS we posted a map on our website that displayed how travel would be managed with completion of the exchange.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		We suggest the following be added to the preferred alternative: The Johnson-Flathead-Grouse trail that connects the west side of the Bridgers. The Johnson-Flathead part has not been identified even though it has existed for years. Although these are relatively short trails, they are very important to 4x4 recreationists and there are no other substitutes.	Fairy Lake	Alternative 7M does propose to provide an ATV connector between Johnson and Grouse Creek. Please see the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.
Mark Young		999	Bozeman	The trail into the Golden Trout and Hidden Lakes region has been widened and eroded. The trail up to Emerald Lake has seen rapid erosion due to increase in motorized traffic.	Gallatin Crest	The preferred alternative 7M proposes to manage the trail to Golden Trout Lakes for foot, stock and mountain bike travel only. The trail to Hidden Lake would be open to motorcycles and ATVs as well. The trail to Emerald Lake is proposed to be open to foot, stock, motorcycle

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						and mountain bike travel. We realize that many routes may not currently meet the engineering standards for the targeted vehicle or use. Some of the routes proposed for ATV use will need to be reconstructed for that use. A proposed guideline would provide the flexibility to keep this route closed until it meets applicable engineering guidelines for the proposed use. Please see Guideline A-12 in Chapter I of the Detailed Description of the Alternatives.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Reopen the new trail just north of the Emerald and Heather trailhead to the Eight Mile Creek divide. Motorized users helped build it.	Gallatin Crest	We are guessing that you are referring to trail #171. Alternatives 1 and 2 considered managing this route for motorized use. The preferred alternative would manage this route for foot, stock and mountain bikes to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities.
John Helvey		58	Bozeman	I would like to see the Gallatin crest trail be closed to motorized. The trail is too rough for motorized and will be torn and eroded with passage of time.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 considered managing the Crest trail as non-motorized. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5 to provide quality motorized single track riding on a historically used route. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to provide quiet non-motorized recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat.
Kerry White		1616		Trail 186 in the Swan goes up to 96 and the county identifies trail #90, 241, and 240 as open to motorized. These three trails are almost the last available into the Yellowstone side of the Gallatin forest and should remain open to motorized. Trail 182 could be opened to motorized to provide a loop of 241 to 240 to 190 back to 96.	Gallatin Crest	The Forest Service has jurisdiction and management responsibility for all National Forest System trails and roads on the Gallatin National Forest. The Forest Service has no information or evidence to indicate that Gallatin County has asserted rights to these or to any other National Forest System trail or road on the Gallatin National Forest. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the decision maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Peter Aengst		489	Bozeman	Second, I was totally appalled by the condition of the trail from Buffalo Horn Pass to Ramshorn Lake and up to the divide just north of Fortress Peak. This trail was an erosion disaster. …there were huge mud bogs, entrenched trail segments, and terrible steep, eroded sections. This area needs major rest from any motorized use and major investments in trail reclamation. Third, for rest of Gallatin Crest I was shocked to think that Forest Service would open this to motor bikes. Not only is this trail hard to follow but it is very rugged and clearly not a constructed trail.	Gallatin Crest	Thank you for this information about the Buffalo Horn/Ramshorn trail system. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision. Alternative 6 considered managing the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Crest trail as non-motorized. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5 to provide quality motorized single track riding on a historically used route. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to provide quiet non-motorized recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat.
Greg Beardslee		737		Windy Pass/Tamphery Trail Scheme: in the double secret Forest Service trail inventory that I have a copy of, there is a suggestion of using the Tamphery trail from Moose Creek to Windy Pass, as a new motorized trail for motorcycles to get to the Crest. This is a good idea. I have recently seen ATV tracks on Windy Pass and feel this is inappropriate and that the entire Crest trail system should remain singletrack. The wear on this route has been considerable, because it was laid out too steeply, motorcycles and horses have caused accelerated wear. If Tamphery became the new motorcycle route, lasting repairs might be made to the trail from Portal Creek.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5 to provide quality motorized single track riding on a historically used route. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction (including the Windy Pass Trail #82) to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to provide quiet non-motorized recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Upper Big Creek trails and Fridley area trails are muddy throughout the summer and need improvements to reduce sediment delivery from motorized use and stock use.	Gallatin Crest	Thank you for this comment about the Upper Big Creek and Fridley area trails. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision. The preferred alternative 7M would manage both of these routes for non-motorized uses yearlong.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Noreen Breeding		1823		The upper half of trail #296 from the peak suffers from motorcycle damage. It is so rough, loose, rutted, and steep that I walked off trail most of the way. Trail #120 is also in poor condition, probably from a combination of excessive horse and motorcycle traffic. I met 3 horse parties in a few hours that day.	Gallatin Crest	Thank you for this comment about trail #296 and #120. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision. The preferred alternative 7M would manage both of these routes for non-motorized uses yearlong.
Loren Blanksma		1194		I rode down Cliff Creek trail from the Gallatin Crest Trail (96) for a short distance only to have the trail disappear. I also rode up Lewis Creek 8181) from the Big Creek road for approximately 2 miles and that trail also disappeared. Consequently, I assume these trails are virtually non-existent and could be closed to all users and eliminated from the travel map entirely.	Gallatin Crest	The Cliff Creek and Lewis Creek trails can be difficult to find in some locations. The Forest does not plan to abandon these trails, but we are aware that they need heavy maintenance.
John Criger		107	Lakewood, CO	Lewis Creek, Hyalite Creek and Fridley Creek new Big Creek-Lewis Creek access could be easily improved be relocation of the trail in section 13 by moving the trail slightly to the west of the Guest Ranch. This trail could also serve as the main feeder to trails that would lead into Hyalite and Fridley Creek. With some effort additional access could be made so that the public would have access to much of the checkerboard land in this area. Currently most of that area is solely the private backyard of a few landowners. Much of it is public land and public should be able to access it.	Gallatin Crest	Access objectives have been identified for the area between Big Creek and North Dry Creek - please see the Chapter 1 of the Detailed Description of the alternatives. Your suggestions are valuable as we determine how best to acquire public access in these areas.
Barb Cestero		800	Bozeman	The porcupine and Buffalo Horn trails, especially in the area around Ramshorn Lake and Peak, are badly damaged. We hiked through that area after a heavy rain and found the trails to be practically unhikeable. They have been steeply eroded in many sections, and turn to slick muddy gumbo when wet.	Gallatin Crest	Thank you for this comment about Trail #1. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Many sections have captured running water and creeks. As a result, multiple user created trails are spreading across these areas, and damage is getting worse. This situation can be corrected with the following changes to the preferred Alternative in the travel plan: Close this area to all motorized travel in the summer, including dirt bikes; Consider seasonal closures in the spring and early summer to horses, mountain bikes, and maybe even hikers.; Reconstruct the most badly damaged parts of these trails to include switchbacks, water bars, and other erosion control measures.		decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision. The preferred alternative would employ seasonal restrictions on this route to stock and mountain bikes (the trail would be closed in the spring to these uses from April 1 - June 15) and motorcycles would be limited to a use season of July 15 - Sept. 5.
Joe Polus		1487		Consider trading the 320 Ranch access for the Teepee Creek access to further reduce user interactions and possible conflicts.	Gallatin River Canyon	Thank you for your comment.
Michael Pierre		1737	Bozeman	In my opinion, the old logging roads branching off the Gallatin Canyon that are open to motorized travel right now are appropriate. In addition, the area south of Hebgen Lake and Quake Lake would be somewhat appropriate for motorized use.	Gallatin River Canyon	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Jery Furtney		240	Townsend	The maps for the preferred alternative show motorized use of the Dudley Creek Rd. #2502 above the USFS parking area and into the private property in section 29, sw 1/4. I believe this is a error since the USFS access across the private property in section 29 is for foot and pack animal access to the wilderness. Any motorized use has no where to go and no parking is allowed in the private. Please advise me on corrections to this error. I believe the motorized use should be restricted to USFS administrative use and to use by private property owners.	Gallatin River Canyon	The Dudley Creek road is a National Forest Road from the Highway the end of the road near the Wilderness boundary. The Forest is trying to encourage public users to not drive beyond the trailhead by providing signing and adequate parking. Alternative 7M continues to leaves the road beyond the trailhead open to all users, including the public while encouraging the public to stop and park at the trailhead.
Kerry White		1616		Trails in the Moose, swan, Squaw, and Little Bear that have been identified as motorized use by the county are 188, 186, 76, 163, 79, 137, 85, 416, 418, 92, 425, 101, 419, 421, and 414. Some of these	Gallatin Roaded	The Forest Service has jurisdiction and management responsibility for all National Forest System trails and roads on the Gallatin National Forest. The Forest Service has no information or evidence to indicate that

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				should be changed. When I was young we used to ride motorcycles to Castle Rock on #92, but it is a little hairy at times along the slide areas. Numbers 85 up the West slope of Garnet is not meant for motorized. Trail 137 travels along highway 191 to Logger Creek. Logger Creek is now wilderness so 137 doesn't do much. I think we could make 85, 137, 92, and 418 non-motorized and the county would go along with this proposal.		Gallatin County has asserted rights to these or to any other National Forest System trail or road on the Gallatin National Forest. The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Alfred McGuire		25		Why not make a motor park like Pipestone from Big Bear west to the Gallatin River. Make new trails acceptable to the motor traffic. Big and little loops, grids. I ride there quite a bit, very seldom you will see a person walking. Its mostly pick-ups, ATVs, motorcycle traffic, not really that many bikes. It would be a good area for it. Big Bear, west to Gallatin River, South to Squaw Creek.	Gallatin Roaded	Many of the roads and trail in the Big Bear to Gallatin River and south to Storm Castle Creek are proposed to be managed as ATV and motorcycle loop routes, and 4x4 high clearance vehicle roads. Please see the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.
Noreen Breeding		1004	Bozeman	Swan Creek trail #186: prohibit motorcycles and mtn bikes. The upper 4-5 miles are in the WSA. The last section of the trail leading to trail #96 has been severely damaged by heedless motorcyclists. Trail # 188: should not have ATV traffic on it unless it is rerouted off the stream bank. Near where it intersects trail #186 it is located w/in inches of Swan Creek, severely damaging the bank and degrading the river. Garnet Mtn: near the top the trail suddenly ends on a steep, rutted and rocky ATV road. The trail should be continued on across the road at the same grade until it reaches the level at the top.	Gallatin Roaded	Thank you for these route management suggestions. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that were occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the decision maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Patti Steinmuller		1132	Gallatin Gateway	The Garnet Mountain hiking trail #85 is similar to the Indian Ridge Trail in the diversity of wildflowers, wildlife, and overall good condition of the trails that have been maintained, in great part, by the volunteer efforts of the Backcountry Horsemen. However, grave differences in trail conditions are apparent following the intersection of the Garnet Mountain Trail with the ORV trail #79 ascending from Rat Lake. The continuing trail to the Garnet Mountain FS cabin is heavily eroded and suffers form the high impact of motorized use. Additionally, several spur trails, "user-created" illegal trails, intersect or occur near the main trail. Over the years, these trails have never been restored, such that, it appears that it may even be challenging for motorized users to ascertain which is the designated trail for motorized use. Since the cost of restoration is so high, especially at this elevation and location, I would like the FS to consider suspending motorized travel in this area of trail #79 until restoration has been done to repair resource damage.	Gallatin Roaded	Thank you for your observations on the Garnet Mtn. trail. The preferred alternative would allow ATVs and motorcycles from the Rat Lake side on trail # 416 to a stopping point about a 1/2 mile below the Lookout. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
Kerry White	Citizens for Balanced Use	1616	Bozeman	Trail #132, Storm Castle Road must not be gated at all. We have a cabin at Purdy Creek and we must have year around access to our cabin. My grand parents hand built this cabin in the early '30s.	Gallatin Roaded	The road is gated to protect the roadbed during the spring and to provide for winter recreational use. The gate would likely remain closed to the public for these reasons. If the private landowners wish access, it would likely be granted, but with weight limit restrictions or requirements for upgrading the road to meet yearlong

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						traffic standards, and snowplowing requirements. If access is desired, the landowner should contact the Bozeman Ranger District for future discussions.
Hank Rate		1038		County roads have not been adequately defined, as per previous comments. In the Gardiner area specifically, existing county roads to Cinnabar Basin via Aldridge and from Jardine to the Highland Chief Mine are not identified.	Gardiner Basin	Park County is responsible for mapping an asserting rights to County roads. The Forest gets it's information from the county. The information shown is the what currently resides in our records. We will correct any records will more accurate information. This travel plan makes no attempt at managing use on county roads.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		The plan is inadequate in its treatment of the issue of public safety on trails designated for multiple, incompatible uses. The short section on safety is a general discussion only; it claims there is no difference between alternatives, and specifically leaves the responsibility for safety with users. The realty is that the FS is creating a potential safety problem anywhere the agency mixes non-motorized travelers with the speed, mass, and power of motor vehicles. Natural hazards due to topography, weather, and wildlife are expected and acceptable risks to trail users, but speeding motor vehicles are not natural hazards; their presence on Forest trails is entirely within FS control. The overriding responsibility for public safety clearly lies with the agency making the decisions on trail allocation. The final plan must analyze hazards, address the obvious differences among the alternatives, and improve separation of incompatible modes of travel.	General	Public safety is addressed in Chapter 4 of the FEIS. As stated in this section three factors influence the safety of users; facility condition, mixture of uses, and user behavior. This issue was considered as non-significant to the Travel Plan decision because these risks are similar for all alternatives. It's not because user safety was considered unimportant. Alternatives 2 through 7-M attempted to separate conflicting uses on roads and trails where safety was an issue. While the proportion of motorized and non-motorized routes vary by alternative, they all provide opportunities for foot and horse travel absent motorized vehicles. Regardless of the alternative selected for a travel plan, providing for user safety will be largely addressed through implementation (i.e. by designing and maintaining facilities to accommodate the designated uses and through user education and information designed to help people understand what to expect on a given route and improve individual behavior.
Todd Orr		1473		Overall, I believe the trail system we have in place adequately addresses the recreational needs for a large percentage of the users for the near future. A few additional motorized loop trails should be considered to reduce the use in some areas and improve the length and quality of the riding experience. I have also recognized and identified trail routes with possible closures and/or restrictions to specific users to reduce damage or possible user-conflicts in a few key areas, while increasing or maintaining the quality of the recreational experience.	General	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Alex Phillips		1483a	Bozeman	For the Hyalite Travel Planning area the reasons given for maximizing roads for ORVs was to minimize the propagation of illegal routes. This	General	We believe that providing a quality system of loop routes in the Hyalite area will help minimize potential trespass issues and the creation of user created routes. All use

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				thinking seems very odd to me: basically the FS is rewarding motorized drivers that make illegal trails. I do not think this is what the FS intended, but this is what is happening, not only in Hyalite, but all over the forest. Please rethink this rational. The best enforcement is for the offender to know that his/her misdeeds will have repercussions.		of motorized vehicles will be restricted to the designated routes identified in the travel plan final decision. This change alone will greatly facilitate our ability to control inappropriate activities in the future.
Don Bachman		625	Bozeman	I am concerned that USFS trail design parameters and National Trail Management Classes are not being used as document resources in determining use designations. The trail parameters and prescriptions must be taken into consideration for each designated use except for foot travel. The capacity for each trail to accommodate the use assigned to it should be factored into the final decision. I feel that the FEIS should display (in an appendix?) the trails to which Standard A-10 will be applied as a remediation, prior to enabling a designation. And the question must be asked that if a current motorized use trail is below standards, yet is designated for motorized use in the Plan; will it be closed until rehabilitated to standards? The GNF should carefully weigh the costs and impacts of bringing trails to A-10 Standards against the need to change their designations.	General	In the preferred alternative, "Guideline A-12 - Implementation" states that "Newly designated routes for passenger cars, 4x4s, and ATVs may remain closed to such uses until the facilities meet applicable engineering standards." Some of the routes proposed to be managed for ATVs and larger vehicles in particular will not be usable immediately by those vehicles. The Forest will be identifying routes shortly after the travel plan decision is finalized that will need to remain closed to the target vehicle type until reconstruction or construction can be accomplished. The implementation tool for travel management provided to us through the recent "National OHV Decision" compels us to annually publish a "motor vehicle use map". Only routes which meet minimal engineering standard for the designated use will be shown as open on this map in a given year. Cost of implementation was a factor taken into consideration in developing the final preferred alternative.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		We encourage you to create durable, easy to read signage of the highest standard to ensure that signs last and are understood.	General	New national protocols for signing have recently been provided to the Forest Service to ensure consistent messages, look, and presentation across the National Forest System. We believe these new signs will meet your expectations.
Reggie Clark		565		Please design trails with all single track users in mind. This involves switch backs that motorbikes can negotiate and puncheon that is not hazardous to horses.	General	Thank you for your comment. All trail reconstruction and heavy maintenance projects as well as new construction are designed to provide safe turning radius for the target user on switchbacks.
Noreen Breeding		454		Why is so much administrative access needed and why must it all be provided by motor vehicle? Is foot or stock access sufficient in some areas?	General	Routes in the preferred alternative identified as "administrative access" were located where necessary to provide fire protection, allow access to manage timber or range allotments access private land inholdings, or to access mining operations. Where roads were identified as surplus to our immediate administrative needs they were labeled "project roads" and will be closed to motorized travel, and in many cases rehabilitated.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Noreen Breeding		454		The DEIS fails to address the issue of funding for Travel Plan implementation. How ill improvements, such as plowing the Hyalite Canyon Road, reconstructing the trails in Bear Canyon for motorized traffic, new trailhead and motorized area boundary signs, new maps, and increased law enforcement, for the next 15-20 years be paid for?	General	Funding for implementation of the travel plan will come from a mix of appropriated funds, grants, and volunteer donations/projects. Please see the Implementation section of the FEIS in Chapter 3 for a more complete discussion of the projected cost to implement the travel plan.
Mark Wistey		1649		Along these lines, it would also be extremely helpful if the trail conditions were posted on the web so GNF users could see their options without having to make a special trip to the USFS office or spend half an hour on the phone each week.	General	A product that the Forest hopes to be able to provide within a year of so of implementing the travel plan decision will be a user friendly web based map display of all the roads and trails on the Forest. This web based map system will identify appropriate uses on each route, seasonal restrictions. Over time, additional information on trail condition may be provided. Please check the Gallatin web page late in the spring of 2007 to see if this product is available then.
Brian Hawthorn	Blue Ribbon Coalition	1196		OHV use is recognized as an acceptable use of the national Forest. The goal should be to use proven recreation management principles to manage vehicle-based recreation that is sustainable, manageable and enjoyable. Objectives: routes should be designated that provide a variety of difficulty, experiences, provide opportunity for a variety of vehicle types, provide access to destinations, the integrity of the "loop" trail system should be maintained. Loop trails offer trail users a more desirable recreational experience; Spurs are suitable for destination features such as scenic overlooks, campsites, viewing historic and cultural resources. These objectives should be accomplished during the OHV route designation process.	Goals and Objectives	We agree.
Peter Aengst		33	Bozeman	It is imperative for ice climbing access in Hyalite that if plowing to Chisholm campground you not gate beyond that point and allow driving to Grotto Falls trailhead at least in prime climbing season of Nov, Dec, January. If funding limited then better to plow to Chisholm those three months and then gate at dam or lower.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M proposes to plow the Hyalite road as far as the Blackmore Day Use site, and allow wheeled vehicle traffic on the road above the dam to the Grotto Falls Trailhead until January 1. Additionally, a snowmobile trail will provide winter long access to the Grotto Falls trailhead from Moser Creek, providing an alternative form of access beyond the dam. In the event that plowing funds are insufficient to plow to Blackmore all winter, the road would be plowed to the Langhor Moser area, and ice climbers could access the area via skis or snowmobiles on the designated route to Grotto

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Falls. Please see the Record of Decision for more discussion on the final winter configuration in Hyalite and alternative plowing scenarios.
Peter Aengst		33		Also, very popular to ski Blackmore Peak in April and May when avalanche conditions are better and so key to allow driving access to Blackmore trailhead in March - May and should gate at dam these months and not lower like Langhor.	Hyalite	The proposal to plow the road in the preferred alternative to the Blackmore Day Use site leaves us with a bit of a spring time road quandary. By plowing the road in the winter, we make it more vulnerable to spring time break up during the freeze thaw cycle. In order to protect the road in the spring, the preferred alternative proposes to close the road at the lower fishing access from April 1-May 15. Skiers could access the canyon at that time on foot or bicycle.
Chris Anderson		34	Bozeman	Don't plow the main road #62; if you have to restrict snowmobiles allow snowmobiling on the main road #62 but ban snowmobiling right or left off the road below the Hy. Reservoir Dam after Dec 1 - Jun 30 (Just an idea). Allow 4-stroke snowmobiles only in Hyalite Drainage. Split the Hyalite Drainage right down the middle - snowmobiling on the right, walkers on the left.	Hyalite	Alternative 1 considered not plowing the road in the Hyalite area and continuing to allow snowmobile access to the entire drainage. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Charlie Crangle		902	Bozeman	Trails are being damaged by erosive ruts caused by powerful motorized recreationalists. I have seen dirt bike damage in wetland areas around Emerald Lake and watched ATVs illegally riding off trail and high marking in Ross Pass. I have seen the trail system in Leverich Canyon churned and eroded to the point of being difficult footing on steep stretches due to dirt bike usage.	Hyalite	Thank you for your comment. We do not feel that the illegal and unfortunate behavior you witnessed is representative of most motorized recreationists. The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Michael Ross		970	Bozeman	Alt #7 prohibits snowmobiles in Hyalite. The FS states it will attempt to plow the Hyalite road. I don't know how this will be done, especially in a heavy snow year and this will be an extreme cost that is not warranted. By shutting motorized vehicle travel off at Hood Creek it would be very hard to access some of the upper areas such as Grotto Falls or Palisades if no motorized could be used such as snowmobiles.	Hyalite	Alternative 1 considered not plowing the road in the Hyalite area and continuing to allow snowmobile access to the entire drainage. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Bean Bowers		1199	Bozeman	I am becoming aware that the USFS may close the winter access to Hyalite canyon at Langhor. This would limit access to the upper parts of the canyon to those with snowmobiles, who can already get up there, and potentenially hurt the visiting ice climbing economy. It seems fine as is and should remain open to vehicles with the clearance and power to get up there.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Catherine Weeden		1604		From conversations with other skiers, I have heard many people say they would be happy to buy a parking sticker or help finance the plowing in other ways, and I have heard people from both BWAGs and MWA say they would be willing to help the GNF with grants or in solving problems related to plowing.	Hyalite	Thank you. Plowing the road to Blackmore is a goal as proposed in the preferred alternative. We realize it will take community support and involvement to realize this goal, and intend to work closely with interested user groups to secure the funding necessary to plow the road. Please see the Record of Decision for discussions on alternative plowing scenarios should funding be insufficient.
Catherine Weeden		1604		Plowing all the way to the reservoir would be best, as the snow is not reliable on Moser and sometimes no in Langhor. Because ski opportunities in the Bridgers are greatly reduced, Hyalite would be a welcome addition to local ski opportunities.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Kerry White		1616		Destruction of government property when mostly college students 4-wheel up there in the winter and burn pallets on the road where they stop, leaving nails that we find in the spring. They have shot up the out houses and made a mess. If we plow to the lake I don't think this is a good idea. We would still have property damage and maybe more accidents on a slick plowed road when drinking occurs and people drive home, injuries are sure to happen. If we plow this road the traffic will force the frost into the road and we won't have a road in the spring. This could put an additional road maintenance cost	Hyalite	The proposal to plow the Hyalite road was met with much public support. We believe that by providing a more managed winter setting in the canyon that we may be able to curtail much of the property damage we currently receive. Mitigation is designed into the preferred alternative which would plow the road as far as the Blackmore Day Use site to protect the road in the spring (the road would be closed to motor vehicle travel from April 1 - May 15). Please see the Record of Decision for more discussion on the rationale for the winter proposal in Hyalite.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				on the taxpayers and I think it unnecessary.		
Kerry White		1616		The problem is that Hyalite doesn't have any trail access until you get to Langhor. Maybe plow to Langohr, make a parking area, and create some cross country skiing trails around Langohr. Many easy trails that are old logging roads exist in this area of Hyalite Canyon. There is a pretty good sledding hill at Langohr and a gate across the road would stop bonfires on the road above Langohr, Ice fishing access would remain with the use of snowmobiles, which is how most people are doing it anyway.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Kerry White		1616		Trails that the county has adopted and identified for motorized use are numbers 436, 456, 431, 213, 433, 171, 432, 434, and 427. Trails 431 and 213 on the west side of the Hyalite reservoir should be changed to non-motorized along with 171 and 432. 433 goes to Palisade Falls and could be left open to winter motorized but should be changed to summer non-motorized on the county plan.	Hyalite	The Forest Service has jurisdiction and management responsibility for all National Forest System trails and roads on the Gallatin National Forest. The Forest Service has no information or evidence to indicate that Gallatin County has asserted rights to these or to any other National Forest System trail or road on the Gallatin National Forest. The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Linda Ellison		1070		I'm glad to see a proposal for bringing back something of a trail system open to motorized use in the area of old Buckskin Creek across from Langhor Campground. I'm wondering though why you don't	Hyalite	This area provides some good big game and riparian habitat that is attractive to elk, moose and deer. Therefore it just never crossed our minds as something to consider as part of the proposal. It's not necessarily a

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				connect that loop with the proposed loop up Lick Creek to keep even more traffic off the main road, especially since there's a road that connects the two already in place.		bad idea and probably could have been considered had we recognized it prior to release of the DEIS. To meet NEPA a public comment opportunity on it would need to be provided. We will consider this option in future modifications to the Travel Plan.
Linda Ellison		1070		I would also like to see the network of logging roads west of Window Rock station be open to ATV access. Unless it has grown up too much by now, you used to get a good view of Palisade Falls from there.	Hyalite	As a commenter notes, this is a network of old logging roads. We just never thought of it as much of an ATV opportunity and therefore didn't identify it. In retrospect it could have been considered in 1 or more alternatives had we recognized it prior to release of the DEIS. To meet NEPA a public comment opportunity on it would need to be provided.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Hyalite to 8 mile - a great potential connector trail. Ancient blazes already exist.	Hyalite	We are guessing that you are referring to trail #171. Alternatives 1 and 2 considered managing this route for motorized use. The preferred alternative would manage this route for foot, stock and mountain bikes to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Blackmore Trail 424: this trail goes to Blackmore Peak and provides an excellent after work ride for singletrack motorized use. An alternate line to Blackmore Peak from the History Rock trail leaving at Inspiration Meadows near the top of Fox Creek is available through a user created trail already there.	Hyalite	In the preferred alternative 7M the Blackmore trail would be closed to motorized use to provide non-motorized trail opportunities in Hyalite Canyon. Several other after work motorized ride options would be available in the Hyalite drainage - including the Heather Emerald Trail, Hyalite Lake/Peak, Wildhorse Lick Creek and Buckskin loops. We felt it was important to provide several options in Hyalite that were managed for non-motorized recreation.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		History Rock Trail 424: this trail in combination with four to three and the user created trail to Blackmore peak would provide an excellent looping opportunity. With South Cottonwood to the west and Bozeman Creek to the east of the Hyalite drainage already being closed to all motorized to use, the closures proposed for the Hyalite area are unjustified. Quiet trail areas are already abundant in this section of the forest.	Hyalite	In the preferred alternative 7M the History Rock Trail would be closed to motorized use to provide non-motorized trail opportunities in Hyalite Canyon. Several other motorized ride options would be available in the Hyalite drainage - including the Heather Emerald Trail, Hyalite Lake/Peak, Wildhorse Lick Creek and Buckskin loops. We felt it was important to provide several options in Hyalite that were managed for non-motorized recreation.
Jack Burns		484	Bozeman	Another trail I have hiked is #424 in the Hyalite canyon. Again it should be limited to non-motorized use. It is too narrow and sight distance too short in some areas. It is not safe if motorized vehicles used the trail.	Hyalite	The History Rock Trail # 424 is proposed in the preferred alternative to be managed for non-motorized recreation activities.
Greg Beardslee		737		Leverich Canyon: ATVs have their place, but not on the current Leverich trail. ATVs have pushed up to the halfway point, crushing the plants on the side of the trail. A ridiculous 4 wheel drive road accesses	Hyalite	Alternative 7M proposes to manage the Leverich Canyon trail for foot, stock and mountain bikes only.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the trailhead itself. There are three illegal trails beside the official one. The Gallatin Ridge Riders are trying to make the main trail better, but if ATVs force their way up and alter the singletrack, where is the incentive for us to help? My vision is to have three trails, one Gallatin National Forest, one by the Gallatin Ridge Riders, and one by the Big Sky Country Trail Preservers. The main historical trail would be for hikers, horses, and mountain bikers. The second trail would be the Elevator Sinhaft trail, remodeled to be sustainable and used for mountain bike downhill and motorcycle uphill and downhill. The third trail, further west, which connects with the Ridgeline logging road, and would be for everyone plus ATVs.		
Patricia Brandon		739		The proposed hyalite trail for bicycles and skateboards is a good idea. How will this be funded? If you are using OHV funds, we need to get something back in exchange.	Hyalite	The preferred alternative 7M would drop the proposal to construct a parallel paved trail along the Hyalite Road. The environmental effects were found to be too great to support this concept.
David Konecny		1371		Hyalite Area: this is also an excellent route for Winter 4x4 travel. The road under is paved so absolutely no erosion or trail degradation as possible.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M proposes to plow the Hyalite road as far as the Blackmore Day Use site, and allow wheeled vehicle traffic on the road above the dam to the Grotto Falls Trailhead until January 1. 4x4 travel would be welcome on the plowed road and to the Main Hyalite Road above the dam to Grotto Falls until January 1. Side roads would be closed to 4x4 vehicle travel on Dec. 2 when most of them become dedicated cross country ski trails.
Alex Phillips		1483a		My question about all this is what happens if the funding is not available right away? It seems to me that putting such a big program in place will take time. It would be too bad to allow the current situation of the trucks and snowmobile chaos to continue. Maybe the agency could issue buttons or parking passes to help pay for the plowing.	Hyalite	The Record of Decision articulates several alternative plowing scenarios should insufficient funds be available for plowing to Blackmore winter long, the preferred alternative.
Joe Polus		1487		Snowmobilers prefer Hyalite road remain as is (no plowing). If road is plowed and funds run out prior to end of season snowmobilers prefer allowed use to revert back as it is today.	Hyalite	Alternative 1 considered not plowing the road in the Hyalite area and continuing to allow snowmobile access to the entire drainage. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Joe Polus		1487		We discussed the extension of trail #171 connecting Hyalite to the Livingston District along an old blazed route on the ridge top.	Hyalite	Alternatives 1 and 2 considered managing this route for motorized use. The preferred alternative would manage this route for foot, stock and mountain bikes to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities.
Greg Beardslee		737		ATVs have their place, but not on the current Leverich trail. ATVs have pushed up to the halfway point, crushing the plants on the side of the trail. A ridiculous 4wd road accesses the trailhead itself. There are 3 illegal trails beside the official one.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M proposes to manage the Leverich Canyon trail for foot, stock and mountain bikes only.
Virginia A. Milne and David B. Milne		676		We also like the proposal to develop a bike and hiking path parallel to the Hyalite Canyon Road, which would alleviate concerns about safety on this popular road.	Hyalite	The preferred alternative 7M would drop the proposal to construct a parallel paved trail along the Hyalite Road. The environmental effects were found to be too great to support this concept.
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		Mt. Blackmore - Hyalite Canyon - Mt Blackmore is a popular destination for skiers in the Gallatin Range. BC skiers like the idea of plowing the road up Hyalite in the winter, because it improves access to the Mt. Blackmore Parking Lot. However, Alt 7 also proposed gating this road low in the canyon from April 1 - May 15. Since this is the season when Mt. Blackmore is skied most often, we would prefer this road be left open during this season.	Hyalite	We are aware that closing the road in the spring makes access more difficult to spring skiing on Blackmore. The trade off to plowing the road in the winter is that we must protect the road surface in the spring because it will be more vulnerable to spring break up once plowed. Skiers would be able to access this area on foot or bicycles in the spring.
Peter Aengst		450		The FS did the right thing by closing this drainage in winter to snowmobiling (though Langhor road could be allowed) and setting up a plan for plowing. However, the following changes need to be made to the preferred alternative: plow the road to Hyalite trailhead from Nov. 1 to Jan 1 (the prime and most popular ice climbing season) and then to just	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. Wheeled vehicles would be allowed on the main Hyalite road to the Grotto Falls Trailhead until

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Chisholm campground until March 1. At both Hyalite trailhead and Chisholm make sure to plow out parking area for 30-40 cars. Plow a berm so that no cars can travel up road up S. Fork of Hyalite (i.e. towards Palisade Falls) but make sure there is no berm plowed on main Hyalite road if money only allows plowing reduced distance or dates from what I recommended above. Gate the road at the dam starting March 15 and only plow to dam parking lot. Finally, if the main paved portion of the Hyalite road must be closed in the spring during freeze/thaw period, then suggest gating it at fishing access starting April 1 and opening it on weekends only during the month of May.		January 1. The snowmobile trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Jim and Marion Kraus		1746	Bozeman	I support plowing Hyalite Canyon in the winter to the Reservoir. If that cannot be done at least plow to mile post 6 (at Langhor Campground). The county already plow to mile post 2.	Hyalite	The preferred alternative would plow the road to Blackmore Day Use site. In the event there would be insufficient funds to plow that distance year long, plan B would be to plow to the Langohr campground. Please see the Record of Decision for the more details about alternative plowing scenarios.
Quint Gidley		1799		Another issue with the Hyalite drainage is the proposed plowing up to the reservoir. This seems preposterous as it will be closed to snowmobiles and open to year-round automobile traffic. This area needs the break in traffic from heavy summer traffic. There are far fewer people up the Hyalite drainage in the winter and this seems like a good thing for wildlife and for those who currently enjoy recreating up Hyalite during the winter.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. Wheeled vehicles would be allowed on the main Hyalite road to the Grotto Falls Trailhead until January 1. The snowmobile trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Tylar Bungar		1216	Bozeman	I would like to see a trail that follows the Hyalite Canyon road. This would allow bikers to ride up and down the Canyon without being on the road. I often see cars that ignore the speed limit on that road. And there are many trails that can be linked only by riding on the road. I think that the single-track trail that once existed in the Skunk Creek drainage should be rebuilt by the people who logged it.	Hyalite	The preferred alternative 7M would drop the proposal to construct a parallel paved trail along the Hyalite Road. The environmental effects were found to be too great to support this concept.
Doug Chabot		1229		I would like to see the FS revert back to the current situation and allow cars to drive to the end of the road. I would be strongly opposed to putting a gate up and closing the road since it would effectively stop all climbing in the area.	Hyalite	The preferred alternative recognized how important reasonable access for ice climbing is in the Hyalite area, but also places an emphasis on providing safe family friendly xc skiing opportunities. Alternative 7M proposes to plow the road to the Blackmore Day Use site, and allow wheeled vehicles above the dam until Jan. 1. Additionally, a designated snowmobile access route to the Grotto Falls trailhead would be provided from the Moser Road Junction. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about road plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow all winter.
Andy Copeland		1245		Construct a new trailhead starting from Hyalite road (section 14) and connecting to Hodgeman Creek trail. The Hodgeman Creek trail would be a wonderful trail for hiking, biking and skiing; but currently it dead-ends in private property.	Hyalite	This suggested route was not brought to our attention during two different comment periods prior to publishing the DEIS and is not included in any alternative.
Jim Earl		1264	Bozeman	Segments 1 and 2 of road #62 (lower section of Hyalite canyon road from the lower fishing access to the reservoir) should not be closed during the period April 1 - May 15. At the very least, moving the closure gate to a point on the road up canyon from Practice rock would allow climbers to get to this popular area in the spring. There is still ice climbing in Hyalite in April Mt. Blackmore provides excellent backcountry ski opportunities - especially in the spring. Closing the Hyalite Canyon Rd. would make access to this ski terrain very difficult.	Hyalite	We are aware that closing the road in the spring makes access more difficult to spring skiing on Blackmore and access to Practice Rock for climbing. The reason for the closure is two-fold. First reason is to provide a non-motorized bicycle opportunity without traffic. Second is to allow the snow on the road, ditches and shoulders to dry off, allow the road maintenance crew to clear bank rock fall off the road and clean ditches, and to allow the road subgrade to thaw and drain any excess moisture without traffic. While to road would handle light traffic during the spring thaw, this action is expected to create less maintenance costs into the future.
Jim Earl		1264		Ice Climbers oppose gating the road at Chisholm campground (the end of the plowing) because in many years it is possible to continue driving up to the Grotto Falls Parking Lot, providing even better access to the ice climbing. We encourage the FS to work to find funding for plowing to benefit all	Hyalite	The preferred alternative recognized how important reasonable access for ice climbing is in the Hyalite area, but also places an emphasis on providing safe family friendly xc skiing opportunities. Alternative 7M proposes to plow the road to the Blackmore Day Use site, and allow wheeled vehicles above the dam until Jan. 1.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				recreational user groups in and near Bozeman.		Additionally, a designated snowmobile access route to the Grotto Falls trailhead would be provided from the Moser Road Junction. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about road plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow all winter.
Patrick R. Callis		1887	Bozeman	Specifically, I would like to see the road plowed to the Grotto Falls Parking Lot into March. At any time, if plowing stops at Chisholm or lower in the canyon, it would be a severe problem for the road to be gated or otherwise blocked. To continue to ice climb season long, I need a motor vehicle access to the Grotto Falls Parking Lot as long as conditions permit. Plowing the East Fork Road to the Emerald Lake Trailhead or to the Palisade Falls Parking Lot is also encouraged.	Hyalite	The preferred alternative recognized how important reasonable access for ice climbing is in the Hyalite area, but also places an emphasis on providing safe family friendly xc skiing opportunities. Alternative 7M proposes to plow the road to the Blackmore Day Use site, and allow wheeled vehicles above the dam until Jan. 1. Additionally, a designated snowmobile access route to the Grotto Falls trailhead would be provided from the Moser Road Junction. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about road plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow all winter.
Angela Schaner and Mark Shyne		853	Bozeman	Access to Window Rock Cabin in the winter: it is too difficult to x-country ski the whole way in, with all the necessary gear. People need to be able to drive snowmobiles to the cabin.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. Wheeled vehicles would be allowed on the main Hyalite road to the Grotto Falls Trailhead until January 1. The snowmobile trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Gary Vodehnal, Carola Murat, Luka Vodehnal,		865	Bozeman	Do not allow motorized use on Leverich Canyon Trail. I watched motorcycles tear up the switch backs on a section of the trail that I helped	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative would manage the Leverich Canyon trail for non-motorized uses, emphasizing foot, stock and mountain bike travel.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Liam Vodehnal				reconstruct.		
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 435 - Leverich - Motorized - Summer and winter - This is good to make a loop from Hyalite to the bottom of mountain over looking Bozeman.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative would manage the Leverich Canyon trail for non-motorized uses, emphasizing foot, stock and mountain bike travel. Alternatives 1 and 2 considered managing this route for summer motorized use. This area would be open to snowmobiles in the winter under the preferred alternative.
Todd Orr		840	Bozeman	#453 - Leverich - this trail provides the only alternate motorized route to the Hyalite drainage motorized trail and road system. This route could provide safer travel to motorized users by passing the dangerous and busy Hyalite Canyon road access.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative would manage the Leverich Canyon trail for non-motorized uses, emphasizing foot, stock and mountain bike travel. Alternatives 1 and 2 considered managing this route for summer motorized use.
Richard Young	MWA/GYC	174	Bozeman	Plow Hyalite so snowshoers and cross-country skiers can access areas around the reservoir and above.	Hyalite	The preferred alternative would plow the road to Blackmore Day Use site. In the event there would be insufficient funds to plow that distance year long, plan B would be to plow to the Langohr campground. Please see the Record of Decision for the more details about alternative plowing scenarios.
Greg, Michelle & Cole Baker		230	Bozeman	Specific regard to the Highlight Drainage we are very concerned that if snowmobiling is prohibited we may not be able to access the backcountry at all. Here is why. If the road is plowed and there are not enough funds to keep the road plowed all winter long, no one will be able to get to the high country at all.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. Wheeled vehicles would be allowed on the main Hyalite road to the Grotto Falls Trailhead until January 1. The snowmobile trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Alison Gidley		236	Livingston	I do not see the need for changing the way Hyalite Reservoir road managed plowing it would not be in the best interest of the watershed or the users.	Hyalite	Alternative 1 considered not plowing the road in the Hyalite area and continuing to allow snowmobile access to the entire drainage. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail to Grotto Falls Trailhead to provide access to ice climbing and rental cabins. Please see the Record of Decision for discussions on rationale.
Patricia Brandon		739	Bozeman	The proposed Hyalite Trail for bicycles and skateboards is a good idea. How will this be funded? If you are using OHV funds, we need to get something back in exchange.	Hyalite	The preferred alternative 7M would drop the proposal to construct a parallel paved trail along the Hyalite Road. The environmental effects were found to be too great to support this concept.
Deanna Larson		95	Livingston	Ibex: We own Section 15, T2N, R11E, PMM on which is located a Forest Service Easement, Project 199.2, a parking area easement, and a portion of Rock Creek Trail Project 270. We note that the documents do not include or specify the plans for these Forest Service projects. In order to make an informed public comment, we need to know what the Forest Service plans are for these projects under the proposed seven alternatives.	Ibex	Site-specific project proposals for road, trail, and trailhead construction, reconstruction, or maintenance are not part of the Travel Plan decision. The Travel Plan addresses appropriate uses of the transportation network. The site-specific proposals will be addressed separately through analysis in compliance with NEPA. The design for these projects will largely be dependent on the uses they are intended to accommodate.
Kerry White		1616		The Rock Creek access must be kept open to multiple use, as it is one of the few remaining areas available south of Livingston. The Livingston Snowmobile Club has worked hard to keep this access open. The evidence we are submitting shows that the Rock Creek road is a county road with a non-exclusive 60 foot right of way. The Forest Service has no jurisdiction over this road. The gate must be moved to the end of the County road and a turn around constructed to accommodate emergency and fire vehicles.	Tom Miner Rock	In the preferred alternative 7M the Rock Creek drainage would be managed as open to snowmobiles. Please see the winter map for alternative 7M. The entire road, above the main Yellowstone Trail South County Road is under jurisdiction of the National Forest. The intention of alternative 7M is to allow the private landowners to plow the road to a parking lot and turnaround to a point where the road enters National Forest Land in section 16.
Ned Zimmerman		1155	Wilsall	I am opposed to any use of Trail 267 which crosses our families private land, some inside, as well as some outside of the national forest boundary. For years the trail has been unused. The FS has shown that it has had difficulty knowing exactly where the trail is supposed to lie because each time a new map of the GNF trail system is printed, trail 267 is in a different place. We urge the Forest to maintain the trails across private property for which they have written easement. Trail 267 is not one of those.	Ibex	Under Alternative 7-M Trail #267 would be targeted as a motorcycle, mountain bike, foot and horse route. The Forest asserts that the Forest and the public has enjoyed the right to use this National Forest Trail for many decades for the prescribed uses. While recorded (writtten) easements don't exist for all segments of the trail (some do on other private lands along this trail), the Forest asserts the right to continue to use this route for public and administrative uses. The Forest is willing to work with any landowner in agreeing to a long-term location and easement of this Forest Trail as long as the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						public and administrative interests are preserved.
Alex Phillips		1483a		Cottonwood Creek is too erodable to allow the heavier, dirt moving tires of ORVs. In the heat and dry of summer even a hiking boot dislodges scoops of soil at each step. If this trail is to be constructed I ask you to be respectful of the meadow and not fill it with switchbacks just to accommodate an ORV or even a trail that is less steep. Alternative seven proposes to allow ATVs and motorcycles. This trail cannot support such heavy equipment on it.	Ibex	Alternative 7M would allow ATVs and motorcycles on the old road portion of the Cottonwood trail to the private land boundary in section 9. The upper single track portions of the existing trail would be managed for foot, stock and mountain bike travel. Please see the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The travel plan revision process cannot legitimize and "adopt" ATV user-created routes into the recognized trail system. FS regs explicitly prohibit the construction of new trails on FS lands without a permit. Because these routes were created by users, they do not comply with FS regs governing travel management before they were "constructed". We recommend the FS find the resources to necessary to close user created routes at this time and then undertake the effort to evaluate which user-created routes may re-open at a later date after an evaluation consistent with the NFMA regs and the executive orders addressing motorized use on public lands.	Issues	The travel planning process provided a comprehensive review of the current road and trail system, and new proposed routes to be added to the system. Some of those routes may have been "user created", some old portions of project roads, and some totally new construction. The travel plan process provided a complete environmental review and comprehensive screening of the appropriateness of adding specific new routes into the system and satisfies NEPA and NFMA regulations. Should construction or significant reconstruction be necessary to accommodate the target vehicles or use on these routes, site specific NEPA will be completed on a case by case basis to evaluate the environmental consequences of the construction or reconstruction.
Kyle Goodyear		1297	Belgrade	Take Todd Orr's survey that was ignored as part of the DEIS. I have the photos are my computer and the damage that has been done can be fixed.	Issues	Todd Orr's data was used in the planning stages of developing the travel plan alternatives, and also during analysis.
Bob Roadarmel		345	Three Forks	To address the erosion problems of OHV use, keep trails well maintained by keeping pipes and culverts cleaned out; putting bridges over open stream crossings; re-route trails around swamps and marshes; if possible, lessen steep grades to keep OHVs from rutting and chewing the trail up; and as a last resort, put temporary closures on trails that are very susceptible to spring runoff.	Issues	All of the techniques and suggestions you make are good ones that we incorporate in our day to day management of the trail system on the forest. Not all trails are able to be maintained to the same degree every year, as funding and personnel limitations do not allow us to maintain the entire 2000 plus mile system to standard every year.
Anonymous		1171		The Teepee Creek rail and Lion Head trail are prime examples of this. The Teepee and Beaver Creek are south of skyline ridge is a very wet area year round and every year that I go there the mud holes get deeper and then the ATV's make new trails out in the meadows to go around them.	Lionhead	Thank you for this comment about these trails. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
Paige Dringman		1008	Big Timber	Trail #122 does not come down the Sweet Grass creek drainage. Your maps still depict a trail across section 7 and implies that a trail may continue down that drainage and join w/ a road in Sec 2. The easement the FS has does not cross any private land in the lower part of the drainage.	Maps	The Forest asserts that the Forest and the public has enjoyed the right to use this National Forest Trail within the National Forest Boundary for many decades. While recorded (writtten) easements don't exist for all segments of the trail, the Forest asserts the right to continue to use this route for public and administrative uses. The Forest is willing to work with any landowner in agreeing to a long-term location and easement of this Forest Trail as long as the public and administrative interests are preserved. In the DEIS Alternative 7M, the Forest has identified an access objective to join this trail from the National Forest Boundary to the County Road and asserts no current rights outside the Forest Boundary.
N. Doyal Yaney		1154	Bozeman	As I look at some of the areas left available for off-road use, I am unable to find Access routes to several of them on your map: East of Wilsall up the Shields River drainage possibly toward Crazy Pk area; SE of Gallatin Gateway unless it's from Portnell Rd area; East of Lookout Pt. in the 2 green areas of the Lee Metcalf Wilderness. A legend designating such Access Routes would be much more meaningful to all concerned.	Maps	The travel plan preferred alternative will prohibit all off-route travel. Summer motor vehicles will be restricted to designated roads and trails. Areas on the maps without designated trails would be off limits to any off-road use. In some areas the travel plan identifies access needs - where there is currently no public access to the Forest. Please see Chapter I of the Detailed Description of the Alternatives pages 23-29 for details on areas where access needs are identified for the preferred alternative.
Kathleen A. Gordon	The eSummit Lighthouse and Church Universal and Triumphant	1236	Corwin Springs	Because roads and trails are private they can be closed, modified, removed in any manner consistent with the private property management objectives of the private property owner. The depiction of trails and roads as they exist on a certain date may well mislead map users. The public roads and trails, which actually could provide valuable references, have not been included on the maps. The public roads and trails within the national forest boundary can be adequately and sufficiently described by reference to other public roads, trails, and markers.	Maps	Historically the Forest Visitors Map has shown many roads not under the jurisdiction of the National Forest, including private roads. USGS 7.5-minute Quadrangle Maps have also displayed the same information for general reference. The Travel Plan maps do the same. Many identified private roads are used during to analysis process as a general measure of total road densities. Unless specifically identified by road number or signing, the Forest Maps makes no implication that any or all roads are either under any specific jurisdiction or open to the public.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				We urge you to remove the non-public roads and trails from the maps.		
Edie Mellgren		656		Policing of ATV traffic in and near the community of Old Chico and in Emigrant Gulch would have to be addressed and presents more questions than this letter has room to examine. Suffice to say one has to be concerned about this riders straying off the designated trail and racing around all over the fragile mountains, making even more eroding trails than there already are.	Mill Creek	The Emigrant Gulch Road in the vicinity of Old Chico is a county public road, and open to motor vehicle travel. Management of this road is outside of the jurisdiction of the Forest Service.
Jeanette Orr		680	Bozeman	Arrastra road was not constructed by the FS, nor has the FS ever maintained this road. We still access mining claims via 4x4 vehicle. Accessing the claims in this manner is necessary in order for us to fulfill requirements set forth in the federal regulations to maintain our claims. In addition, two separate parcels of private land, also held by our family, exist at both ends of the Arrastra road. A 4x4 vehicle has been, and continues to be, the only way to reasonably access our property for mining purposes. Alternatives 2-7 should be amended to continue to allow high clearance 4x4 vehicles.	Mill Creek	Standard A-8 which describes prohibitions to off route travel, also notes exceptions when motorized vehicles other than the designated vehicle type may be allowed to use forest roads or trails. The Livingston District Ranger may authorize you under permit to access your mining claims with a 4x4 in the Arrasta area . Please see Chapter I of the Detailed Description of the alternatives. The preferred alternative would allow public use of ATVs on this route in the summer.
Jeanette Orr		680		The second issue concerning Arrastra road is the proposed ATV connector trail. As it stands now, Arrastra road traverses on and off our private property, as well as ends on it. There is no mention or objective listed in the travel plan to obtain an easement for the proposed connector. The FS does not have an easement for this road because the property became privately held in 1903 and the FS was not established until 1905.	Mill Creek	Our records indicate that this road is a National Forest System road under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service. Unless our records or a landowner can demonstrate otherwise with recorded documents, we have continued to show these roads as Forest roads with rights to manage traffic on these routes.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Sixmile Road #348, Mill Creek Road #486, Counts Creek Road #1764, Upper Snowbank Road #6998 need resurfacing and/or drainage improvements.	Mill Creek	Thank you for your feedback on these roads. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
Paul Bradley		227		I encourage development of a trailhead and access on Strawberry Creek and Emigrant Creek, as there currently are none or very restricted only. Again foot and horseback travel only would be current.	Mill Creek	The travel plan preferred alternative identifies an access objective for the Strawberry Creek area. Please see Chapter I of the Detailed Description of the Alternatives. Trailhead facilities would be located and constructed once this legal access is obtained, and are not addressed in this decision.
Jim Barrett		881		The Elephant trailhead should not be moved. If vehicles are denied access through the 63 Ranch trail users will cross the ranch increasing already present conflicts w/ the current landowner.	Mission Creek	The Mission Creek Trailhead would continue to be managed in its current location under the preferred alternative 7M.
Bob Ebinger/ Robin Hoggan Ebinger		906	Livingston	The Elephant trailhead should not be moved. If vehicles are denied access through the 63 Ranch trail users will cross the ranch increasing already present conflicts w/ the current landowner.	Mission Creek	The Mission Creek Trailhead would continue to be managed in its current location under the preferred alternative 7M.
Daniel Thums		988	Livingston	The access to the Mission Creek trailhead (Elephant Head) should remain the same. Moving the trailhead to Bruffey Lane would only bring more conflict w/ the land owner, decreasing public land access.	Mission Creek	The Mission Creek Trailhead would continue to be managed in its current location under the preferred alternative 7M.
Dale Sexton		1127		Don't change the elephant head trailhead. Accessing this trail head is already a challenge given the possibility of having a run in with Bud Cahill. One only wonders what will happen if those seeking access are not afforded the protection of their vehicles when they come upon Bud. He has ruined many days for far too many people who were simply seeking a day of solace in the mountains.	Mission Creek	The Mission Creek Trailhead would continue to be managed in its current location under the preferred alternative 7M.
Steve Caldwell		618		I am opposed to any proposal to relocate the Elephanthead Trailhead to Bruffey lane from its existing location about the 63 Ranch. The long history of landowner conflict in this area would be more, rather than less, likely to continue and worsen if hikers, horsemen, skiers and other recreational users were forced to traverse this parcel of private land without their vehicles. This proposal also conflicts with your Goal 1 for the Mission Creek area, in that it does not provide for passenger vehicle access to this important wilderness trailhead.	Mission Creek	The Mission Creek Trailhead would continue to be managed in its current location under the preferred alternative 7M.
Erik Guss		575	Bozeman	I do not support moving the trailhead farther away to avoid landowner conflicts. This is an established access and this is an excellent backcountry ski and	Mission Creek	The Mission Creek Trailhead would continue to be managed in its current location under the preferred alternative 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				ice climbing drainage which would be out of reach if another 2 miles were added on.		
Shana Wood		1715		I strongly disagree with the proposal to move the Mission Creek Trailhead (the one with access to the Elephanthead area) to an area beyond the 63 Ranch. Bud Cahill is an ornery person but that is no excuse to cater to his whims and move the trailhead. The access is legal and better where it is currently. I'd rather drive across the 63 Ranch than walk.	Mission Creek	The Mission Creek Trailhead would continue to be managed in its current location under the preferred alternative 7M.
Loren Blanksma		1194		I do object to closing Mission Creek Road (649) because closing any road is a step in the wrong direction when prescriptive access legality issues surface. The remaining roads (Suce Creek 201, Livingston Peak 2532) should remain open to motorized use.	Mission Creek	The Mission Creek Trailhead would continue to be managed in its current location under the preferred alternative 7M.
Pat Thums		862		I would also like to see the access to the Mission Creek Trailhead stay the way it is. Having to park at Bruffey Lane adds quite a bit of logistics and time to that access.	Mission Creek	The Mission Creek Trailhead would continue to be managed in its current location under the preferred alternative 7M.
Paul Bradley		227		I disagree with your proposal closure of road #649 crosses an outfitting/dud ranch operation the owner of which is very contentious. Several years ago the right to this access was a hard fought battle with the land owner by the Forest Service and a local sportsman's group. If you move the trailhead back this land owner will make it difficult for anyone on foot, horseback or otherwise they try to use the current route to the current trailhead. I would prefer to see improvements done to the current road or the current trail head.	Mission Creek	The Mission Creek Trailhead would continue to be managed in its current location under the preferred alternative 7M.
Todd Orr		1473		Most user-made motorcycle trails were from a pass or two by individual riders attempting a short hill-climb or by switchback shortcutting. Having ridden these trails, I have experienced the danger and difficulty of maneuvering around many switchbacks that are too steep and tight for motorcycles. Trail switchback work is needed in some of these areas and would certainly reduce the majority of switchback occurrences.	Motorcycles	The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Joe Polus		1487		The current trailhead sign for a route open to motorcycles is a picture of a motorcycle with a big red slash through it. Below this sign in very small text is a set of dates which indicate a period of time when the route is closed to motorcycles-during other times it is open. This signage gives all trail users the initial impression that the trail is closed to motorcycles - Many hikers see this sign and wrongly assume that they will not encounter motorcycles when they hike these trails. These misleading signs set trail users up for conflict with each other when they encounter one another in the woods. User conflicts on the GNF could be vastly reduced if these confusing signs were replaced with "shared use" trail signs.	Motorcycles	This is a good observation. One of our goals in implenting the Travel Plan will be to provide better user information. Signing will be a big part of that effort. We will consider this suggestion.
Keith Allen		1770	Colorado	I noticed a vague "grouping of use" when reading the DEIS Summary. I would like to emphasize that what is important about off-highway motorcycling in the Gallatin is the narrow, single-track nature of the rails. Off-highway motorcycling is by far more closely aligned with mountain biking than with ATVs or 4x4s. You could simplify the charts and trail miles statistics and metrics by simply grouping them as single-track motorized, single track-non-motorized or dual-track meaning ATV wide or wider. Off-highway motorcyclists in general have no desire to ride on ATV type trails and so ATV trail miles should not be counted under the total motorcycle miles.	Motorcycles	Thanks for this feedback. During scoping for the benchmark, and again during the review of the draft alternatives, we learned that motorcyclists have very different wants and desires than other OHV users. In response to this, we designed specific opportunities into the range of alternatives that provide the single track riding experience that motorcyclists are seeking. The FEIS clearly distinguishes single track motorcycle opportunties, and feedback from this user group helped us fine tune the preferred alternative 7M to ensure we were providing high quality opportunities.
Loren Blanksma		1194	Bozeman	There are many rugged, narrow single track trails in areas that ATVs are simply not designed to navigate, and these trails should remain motorized single track. The distinction between motorcycles and ATVs should be maintained in the travel plan.	Motorcycles	We agree.
Loren Blanksma		1194		Erosion control can be a significant issue with horses or ATVs, but not with motorcycles that are ridden responsibly, abiding by the OHV rules. Most single track trails are very rocky, and thus cannot be damaged by motorcycles.	Motorcycles	Please see Chapter 3, Soils, for a discussion on the differing affects that stock, hikers, motorcycles, etc. can have on soil erosion.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The past 5 years of drought have made a June 1 opening of most trails to motorized use very reasonable. Although when more normal weather patterns return, July 1 would be a more typically acceptable date for opening motorized use in the	Motorcycles	Seasonal restrictions are designed to do several things: protect trail or road resources from damage, provide secure wildlife habitat during critical periods, or to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities during certain times of the year. Please see Chapter II of the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				higher elevations. The FS should exercise a flexible decision on motorized trail openings based on a year by year basis, depending on trail conditions. The end of the motorized season is currently dictated by the first significant snowfall which automatically eliminates motorcycles from the trails. In most cases, to close the motorized trails Sept. 15 is too short of a season. August, Sept, and most of Oct. are usually excellent times for motorized use because the snow banks have receded and the summer weather patterns generally create relatively dry trail conditions.		Detailed Description of the Alternatives for brief discussions on the rationale for various seasonal restrictions. Please see the Record of Decision for more discussion on rationale.
Tom Bozeman		891	Bozeman	The speed and power differential between muscle power and machine power is quite acute and can lead to lethal encounters. Motorized vehicles are very hard on trails, plowing them into rutted impassible messes. Many motorized vehicle users don't respect the trails, considering the meadows and slopes of the forest to be de facto motocross tracks.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Herb Davis	Lone Mtn Ranch	903	Big Sky	We encourage the Forest Supervisor to insure the vitality of the forest resources by adopting a sound travel mgt plan that reflects the current predominance of non-motorized use and to correct any unacceptable resource damage that is occurring due to the use forest roads, trails and areas open to cross country travel.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Jane Gentholts		916	Bozeman	I have averaged over 800 miles on my mtn bike the last 3 yrs. I have seen 5 violations of trail usage limitations (ie - "no motorized" usage) this year alone. Four ATVs riding the banks up and down Squaw Creek near Rat Lake, abuse on the Pioneer Lakes cutoff trail, abuse on the Grassy Mtn/ Olson Cr/ Stone Cr trail, abuse on the Little Wapiti/ Oil Well Road trail & abuse on the Swan Cr trail.	Motorized (General)	Thank you for sharing your observations. We encourage you to report these sorts of encounters to your local District Ranger or by calling 1-800-TIP-MONT. The travel plan decision will prohibit all off-route travel of summer motor vehicles through a designated route system of roads and trails.
Tom Heintz	Gallatin Outfitters Assn	1014	Bozeman	While wheeled vehicles of any kind cause serious damage to trails when they are wet, horses generally do not. Early season closures make sense for	Motorized (General)	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				wheeled vehicles - that does not necessarily hold true for stock.		number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See Chapter II - The Detailed Description of Alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	The Forest currently uses seasonal restrictions to control most motorized uses during the vulnerable spring period, but has a few non-motorized restrictions to protect the trails from similar damage." Not restricting all users when impacts are real is poor management as well is discrimination.	Motorized (general)	Alternatives 2-6 proposed to employ seasonal restrictions for motorized users, stock and mountain bikes in the spring to protect trail resources. Alternative 7M would employ seasonal restrictions on a route by route basis for motorized use, stock and mountain bikes. Each route was reviewed and mitigation applied through seasonal restrictions case by case to resolve issues with facility protection, provide secure wildlife habitat during critical periods, or to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities. Please see Chapter II of the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for rationale associated with each proposed seasonal restriction. Please see the Record of Decision for additional rationale regarding seasonal restrictions.
Pat Simmons	Sierra Club	1545		It is our understanding that trails designated for motorized use will be upgraded to support the designated use. Recommend that trails designated for upgrading be closed to motorized traffic until they have been upgraded and deemed capable for specific traffic loads. If that is not done trails will continue to suffer abuse and then upgrading becomes a more costly and time consuming endeavor.	Motorized (General)	In the preferred alternative, "Guideline A-12 - Implementation" states that "Newly designated routes for passenger cars, 4x4s, and ATVs may remain closed to such uses until the facilities meet applicable engineering standards." Some of the routes proposed to be managed for ATVs and larger vehicles in particular will not be usable immediately by those vehicles. The Forest will be identifying routes shortly after the travel plan decision is finalized that will need to remain closed to the target vehicle type until reconstruction or construction can be accomplished. The implementation tool for travel management provided to us through the recent "National OHV Decision" compels us to annually publish a "motor vehicle use map". Only routes which meet minimal engineering standard for the designated use will be shown as open on this map in a given year.
Julie Hager		1306	Belgrade	There are problems with some of the trails. There are places that are damaged, and need improvements and better signs to prevent further erosion: however the damage is not caused by wheels a loan, a fact you neither recognize nor acknowledge.	Motorized (General)	We are aware that many different users contribute to trail degradation, from hikers to horseback riders to motor vehicle users, as does poor design/location/maintenance in some locations. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
Todd Orr		1473	Bozeman	During the 2003/04 seasons, I rode approximately 2700 miles of trails on the Gallatin Forest. Approximately 894 miles of motorized trail were GPS'd. I found that the vast majority of motorized trails on the Gallatin are not designed nor maintained for use by motorized beginners. Numerous trails are only useable by the most elite and expert riders. The beginner and intermediate rider will have much difficulty in places and occasional crashes are inevitable. Injury is possible.	Motorized (General)	Thank you for this information. The travel plan preferred alternative strives to provide opportunties for all levels of expertise. Your information will be helpful in prioritizing future maintenance projects.
Todd Orr		1473		Most motorized trails are experiencing low to moderate use and show very low to no signs of erosion or damage. A few trails with more sensitive soils and experiencing higher use, show signs of increased erosion and damage. Dispersing use and reducing the concentration of use on a given trail plainly reduces erosion and damage in most all cases. Most all motorized trail damage I observed could be repaired without extensive effort or great difficulty, or would naturally heal over in a short period of time.	Motorized (General)	Thank you for your observations.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		GNF has asked for specific input on the location of motorized trails but then have taken the position that GPS files and formats are not acceptable. This lack of willingness to accept the information and work with it is more evidence of the built-in bias in the process.	Motorized (General)	To our knowledge, the Forest has not received from the public any GPS files for use in the plan. GPS information collected by Forest personnel is used throughout the travel plan mapping and analysis effort.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		We suggest that road decommissioning funds be used instead to maintain motorized trails. We suggest that his expenditure would benefit the public and environment in a more positive way.	Motorized (General)	Funding for road decommissioning often becomes available through dollars targeted by Congress for watershed rehabilitation work, the Agency does not have the discretion to "reallocate" these funds to other trail maintenance projects.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency	587		We believe motorized access to camping sites in ecologically sensitive areas should be restricted even if they are within 300 feet of designated routes. Would it be appropriate to identify and designate	Motorized (General)	Several areas on the Forest were identified where dispersed camping within route corridors has historically caused undue resource impacts. The preferred alternative identified several specific areas like Bear

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Region 8, Montana Office			camping sites that avoid sensitive areas and/or to encourage camping or concentrated public use in areas that are more resilient and can more easily recover from impacts and/or accommodate public use with less impacts?		Canyon where camping within 300' of the designated route would not be permitted except at designated sites. Please see the Record of Decision for more discussion and site specific information on areas where dispersed camping would be limited to designated sites.
Trish Kerby		145		A few of the trails that are for motorcycle use - how should "fixing" them good enough for ATV uses. Not everyone can ride a motorcycle you know. It seems that there are more motorcycle trails that ATV trails.	Motorized (General)	The preferred alternative 7M identified approximately 534 miles of ATV routes, and 296 miles of motorcycle trails. Please see the summer motorized maps for alternative 7M.
Frank Shanley	Billing Motorcycle Club	163	Billings	Need to keep trails open that loop around.	Motorized (General)	We agree that loop trails provide the best recreation opportunities and we've attempted to add loops into the motorized trail system in the preferred alternative.
David Courts		277		The indentations caused by mountain bike tires on muddy trails used primarily by stock and hikers can concentrate rain and snowmelt runoff and create substantial gullies in a short period of time. I encourage the Forest to restrict mountain bikes to routes that have hard surfaces not susceptible to erosion.	Mountain Bikes	We considered restricting mountain bikes to designated routes in the EIS, but not in detail. Some parts of the country are incurring problems with off-route mountain biking, but that is not the case on the Gallatin. There are no known areas on the Forest where off-route mountain bike impacts would compel us to manage biking only on specific routes. Please see Chapter 3 the Soils discussion for a comparison of the erosive effects of different recreation uses.
Corey Biggers		1003	Belgrade	The only trail in the Gallatin Crest getting hammered is Buffalo Horn. The damage is from horses riding around water bars making 2 or 3 trails instead of 1. The Sage Creek trail is a disaster from horses on the lower end. Upper Hyalite and the M are being shortcut by hikers. Plow the road to Spanish Creek trailhead in the winter for access by x-c skiers and snowshoers to the wilderness.	Non-Motorized (General)	Thank you for these observations. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision. In the preferred alternative the Spanish Creek road where it leaves the county road on the Turner Ranch would be managed as a cross country ski trail. The road actually provides a better skiing opportunity than do trails further up on the forest.
David Strong		1574	Billings	We ought to be asking the question of whether any road in the GNF can be justified as being open. Those that do not have solid, justifiable reasons to	Non-Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				remain open ought to be closed to any motorized traffic, ripped up, and restored to natural conditions.		designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Brendan Mumey and Susan Gallagher		503	Bozeman	We have noticed an increase in ATV and snowmobile use in the backcountry and we strongly believe that such usage should be severely curtailed. As a case in point, consider the Bear Canyon loop that goes up to Bear Lakes. This trail is in absolutely disastrous shape as a result of ATV and motorbike use. We have decided to just forget about going on this trail as it is so damaged.	Non-motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized uses are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Pat Jennings		753	Belgrade	There are several trails I no longer use because the ATVs and motorbikes have made them really hard to walk. Some are Bucks Ridge down the Gallatin; Albro Lake, Sailor Lake and Beall Lake in the Tobacco Roots; Cottonwood on the west side of the Crazies; and Heather/Emerald and Hyalite in the Gallatin's.	Non-Motorized (General)	Several of the trails you note in your comment are on the Beaverhead Deerlodge National Forest, and are not being considered in this analysis. The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
David King		755	Bozeman	I would hope that motorized access in the winter would be restricted for 4-wheelers. I have been in many areas where a snowmobile track is nice to follow on skis, but a four wheeler track is terrible! Early season and increasingly into middle and even late season, four wheelers are in the mountains working their way through the snow. On a trail it is terrible! The tracks are too wide to have one ski in each track and the center hump is too narrow to have both skis.	Non-Motorized (General)	Proposed standard A-10 would prohibit wheeled vehicles from traveling on groomed or marked snowmobile or ski trails from Dec. 1 - April 15 annually.
Paul Griffin	Gallatin Wildlife Association	707		GWA supports the access needs for the North Bridgers *page I-8) to perfect trail access across checkerboard private inholdings.	North Bridgers	Thank you for your comment.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
LaMonte J. Schnur	Monte's Guiding & Mountain Outfitting	14	Townsend	An important trail segment has been omitted from the Gallatin Forest Travel Plan. This trail used to be known as the Divide Trail, all the way from Hyalite to past Mill Creek. The National Park Service calls is the Skyrim Trail between Buffalo Horn and Mill Creek. That portion of the trail, over 12 miles long, has been omitted. It is frequently used by hikers and horsemen, including hunters, to travel between the Buffalo Horn drainage and Mill Creek drainage, to visit such places as Shooting Star Peak, Sheep Mountain, Bighorn Peak, and Specimen Ridge. I have recently learned that, the FS came to understand that the Park Service would maintain the trail. So far as I know, there is not a written record of this understanding. Since there are no records of the FS trail maintenance in the past several decades, the trail was not even mentioned in the draft travel plan. I further recommend that the FS and the NPS work out a formal agreement that clarifies that this is a FS trail that allows public access to national forest lands as well as to certain trails entering/exiting the Park; 2 - grants the FS authority to maintain or contract necessary maintenance on the trail; 3 - recognizes the legitimate use of the trail by hunters; 4 - recognizes that the NPS may have a legitimate presence on the trail to enforce regulations relative to uses within YNP.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	This trail is in fact shown on the Travel Plan Map. The Gallatin Crest Trail #97 goes from Hyalite to the Park Boundary. The trail along the Park boundary to Mill Creek area is under the jurisdiction of Yellowstone National Park and is mostly obscured by the park/forest boundary line symbol.
Steve Baker		1001	Bozeman	I have pictures of the ground up Buffalo Horn trail to Ramshorn that the horses tore up getting around the down trees.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Thank you for your comment.
Kerry White		1616		I snowmobile on the Big Sky trail every year but I hesitate dropping into porcupine as the trail is in need of maintenance and can be very hard to climb the switchback to come out. We should try and provide access to the highway out porcupine.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	We are aware that the segment of the Big Sky Snowmobile trail from Portal Creek to Elkhorn Ridge can be very challenging riding. The travel plan preferred alternative would continue to maintain this trail in it's current location, as a marked (not groomed) route through the Porcupine area. No alternative considered a Porcupine exit for this trail, to protect important big game winter range.
Elizabeth Shuler		1041	Great Falls	Trails in these areas provide excellence loop opportunities to disperse the use and reduce any resource damage or user conflicts by eliminating having to backtrack on the same trail.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	We concur that these loop trails provide valuable recreation opportunities.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
C. William Smith		1042	Gallatin Gate Way	The porcupine trail is a ditch at the bottom and the rock pile at the top due almost entirely to the commercial horses that chop it up in the mud of the spring and the snow in the fall. Take note of all the damage done by horses and hikers in the last 10 years and the damage not done by trail bikes in the last 35 years.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	We appreciate your concern relative to the effect that stock use may have in certain areas, and acknowledge that stock use can have a negative effect on trail condition. Effects from stock were considered in the design of the proposed preferred alternative, and in some cases and in certain alternatives, stock restrictions proposed to mitigate those effects. Several commentors indicated concern with effects from the commercial use of stock, from damaged trails to multiple trailing in some areas. We considered this, and concluded that it was not appropriate to address this stock issue through the travel plan, but rather through the administration of special use permits for stock supported activities.
Thomas B. Wells		553		Porcupine Buffalo Core Trails - These trails are feeders to the Crest. Motorcycles increase the problems in this area. Neither motorcycles nor mountain bikes are compatible with the heavy stock use these trails receive.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Loren Blanksma		1194		If it were my only option, I would close the trails that dead end at the YNP boundary and even some other trails that are in close vicinity to each other in exchange for leaving other more viable motorcycle trails open. Wilson Draw Trail (161), Cutoff Trail (560), SE Buffalo Horn trails (95, 100) Tom Miner Divide Trail (296 south of Buffalo Horn Pass), Sunlight trail (291), Ramshorn Lake to Buffalo Horn Pass trail 9174), Buffalo Horn Lakes trail to Daily Pass (57), all could be closed in exchange that the following trails be left open to motorcycles: Teepee Creek trail (39), Tom Miner Divide trail (296) north of Buffalo Horn Pass to Ramshorn Peak (to leave this trail accessible should not have a big impact since the trail simply follows the ridge and the Buffalo Horn pass trails), at least one route should be left open to motorcycles to provide a connector route between Windy Pass and Ramshorn Lake, Gallatin Crest Trail (96) in conjunction with the connector trail (299), or	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Thank you for these suggestions. A variety of motorcycle configurations were considered in alternatives 2-6, some of which match your suggestions. Alternative 7M would provide several high quality motorcycle loop opportunities, and a portion of the "Crest" trail (from the Moose Ck. Trail junction north to Hyalite) with several opportunities to ride in side drainages on the Gallatin River side of the divide. This proposal would provide high quality single track riding opportunities, provide a connected route from Bozeman to the Hebgen Basin, and protect wilderness character in the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area. Please see the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				part of the Gallatin Crest Trail in connection with Onion Basin (34).		
Loren Blanksma		1194		I also noticed that Alt 7 opens Hidden lake Trail (179) to ATVs as a destination trail. I do not object, however since that short trail was one of the most challenging motorcycle routes I have ever ridden, I do not see the possibility of navigating this trail with ATVs short of considerable trail work being performed.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Thanks for this information. Several of the routes that we've identified for ATV trails will require construction and reconstruction to safely accommodate these vehicles. Use by the target vehicle may be restricted until the route meets minimum engineering standards for the intended use.
Todd Orr		840		66 - First Creek - Suggest managing as closed to ATV use to prevent further ATV trail extension down the single track trail into First Creek.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	In the preferred alternative 7M, trail 66 would be managed for foot, stock, mountain bike and motorcycle travel only. ATVs would be prohibited.
Todd Orr		840		96 - Crest Trail - Suggest improving trail to allow continuing motorcycle access along Crest and loop back into Porcupine on trail 299.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	This configuration was considered in alternatives 1-4. In alternative 7M, the "Crest" trail south of Windy Pass would be managed for foot and stock travel, to improve grizzly bear habitat and provide opportunities for non-motorized recreation.
Todd Orr		840		96 - Crest - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use throughout. Suggest installing a few trail posts or cairns to identify faded sections of trail. Some areas and switchbacks could use minor trail maintenance to prevent any switchback cutting or injuries.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The configuration you suggest was analyzed in alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail would be managed for foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities.
Todd Orr		840		96 - Crest - windy Pass Cabin North to Cliff Creek - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use. Suggest signing and managing as closed to ATV use along Crest Trail and closed to all motorized on Windy Pass trail 82, to reduce conflicts with high non-motorized use. Suggest installing a few trail posts or cairns to identify faded sections of trail.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail (including the Windy Pass Trail #82) would be managed for foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities.
Joe Lawellin		13		Do not waste money by using hand tools only when cleaning trails in the wilderness areas. Lift the restrictions for wilderness trail crews while they are deployed so the time spent clearing and cleaning is cost-effective. Allow chain saws and modern small equipment to be used to get the jobs done faster. This will also mean many more miles of trail can be cleared for the same dollars.	Roadless, Wilderness, Recommended Wilderness	Forest Service policy is for trail crews to maintain trails within designated wilderness with "primitive tools". The Gallatin travel plan does not address trail maintenance methods, but rather focuses its analysis on what are the appropriate uses of the road and trail system.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	The trail that runs near the Yellowstone Park line should be open to motorcycle use for about 8 mile from Daley pass.	Sawtooth	The trail you are referring to east of Dailey Pass follows the Gallatin NF and Yellowstone National Park Boundary south of the terminus of the Gallatin's trail #296 in T 8S, R5E, Section 27. This trail is under the jurisdiction of the Park Service and was not addressed in this travel plan. They currently manage this trail as closed to motorized use. The trail symbol is obscured on the Gallatin Maps, underneath the Forest/Park boundary symbol.
Eva Patten and Patti Steinmuller	BWAGs	467	Bozeman	Cinnamon Trail #6, where we hike, is open to motorcycles. This is a popular trail where overuse has created problems of stream damage at trail crossings and on steep portions, eroding fragile soil. It is prime habitat for grizzlies.	Taylor Fork	Thank you for this comment about Trail #6. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
Will Robertson		304		one problem is in improper signing. Last summer, while biking a Little Wapiti Trail in the Taylor Fork drainage, I followed fresh ATV tracks (which were trampling the wildflowers on either side of the trail). This is one of the most perfect single tracks in all of the Gallatin Forest. The trail is impassable to ATVs due to the steep switch back halfway down, but they were exploring the trail anyway (even though the trail is not ATV width). When I met them on their way back up, they said they had no idea that the trail was not open to them. At the bottom of the trail a forest service sign reads "open to ATVs" and at the top of the trail there is no usage sign. I know the forest service is limited in staff and time, but it would be easy to find 100 volunteers, at least from the mountain bike in motorcycle communities, to install trail usage signs.	Taylor Fork	We recognize that poor signing and maps that are difficult to understand have contributed to inappropriate use of trails in the past. However - the activity you witnessed is currently illegal. The Montana/Dakota OHV decision prohibited trail vehicles from riding on trails on which their vehicles don't fit. Regardless - the travel plan decision will limit all summer motorized vehicles to designated routes - specific to vehicle type. New regulations which were enacted in 2005 will make the motor vehicle use maps of the future the legal instrument for implementing travel plan decisions. It will be the responsibility of the rider to know if they are on a legally designated route. Improved maps, signing, and information campaigns will all help to curb the illegal use of closed routes. The forest intends to improve signing and provide better maps and brochures as we implement the travel plan decision, to ensure that recreationists are aware of their riding options.
David Bechberger		738		My fourth concern is the damage and overuse of trails by stock, particularly in the Taylor Fork of and	Taylor Fork	We appreciate your concern relative to the effect that stock use may have in certain areas, and acknowledge

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Spanish Creek areas. I have seen tremendous amounts of trail damage due to stock use on trails such as Spanish Creek Trail (407) as well as on multiple trails around the Taylor Fork area. As far as I can tell a lot of the damage in the Taylor Fork area is from trail rides from the local dude ranches. I personally find it unacceptable that a business makes money off the damaging public lands in such a way that it makes it difficult for others to use it. I believe that limiting stock used to only certain trails in these heavily used areas would allow those of us who don't want to be around horses and the problems they create a place to enjoy these areas.		that stock use can have a negative effect on trail condition. Effects from stock were considered in the design of the proposed preferred alternative, and in some cases and in certain alternatives, stock restrictions proposed to mitigate those effects. Several commentors indicated concern with effects from the commercial use of stock, from damaged trails to multiple trailing in some areas. We considered this, and concluded that it was not appropriate to address this stock issue through the travel plan, but rather through the administration of special use permits for stock supported activities.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Snowmobile travel continues to occur along the highway 191 right of way from the Taylor Fork area to Big Sky. This was not addressed in the Draft Travel Plan even though many snowmobilers travel this route utilizing Forest and MDT properties. At a number of points along this corridor where there is the potential for snowmobile and Highway traffic conflict or collision. You should address this issue in your final Travel Plan.	Taylor Fork	This issue is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation (MDOT) and should be referred to them for consideration. MDOT across National Forest Lands has been granted the right to own and operate a highway and has responsibility for safety within the described rights-of-way.
Tim Beardsley		1646		Inspiration Divide Trail #8 should be closed to all motorized vehicles and mountain bikes for safety reasons. This trail has narrow spots with some switch backs that make it very dangerous for people on horseback to pass vehicles and mountain bikes, whether they are moving or not.	Taylor Fork	In the preferred alternative, the Inspiration Ridge Trail #8 would be closed to motorized use south of its junction with the Buck Ridge Trail #10. The trail would also be managed for non-motorized use in Muddy Creek - north of the junction with Trail #157. Please see the summer motorized map.
Joseph Bartlette		175	Big Timber	On alternative plan 7, where Rock Creek Road south of Livingston, is to be upgraded to passenger car use would be extremely expensive due to planning and survey costs plus actual construction and maintenance. Construction of turnouts, widening and reducing grade on the second mile of the road would involve blasting and would endanger private property in this area plus widening, culverts, and gravel hauling on the last five miles into the campground would greatly increase the cost.	Tom Miner Rock	The South Rock Road #993 is currently managed for passenger cars by annual maintenance. While minimally meeting passenger car standards today, increased maintenance and improvements have been requested by, and in some cases accomplished by, the private landowners. As traffic increases on a road, in this case primarily the result of private land residential development, road standards needs to be considered that match the type, speed, and volume of traffic. Specific road work improvements are not addressed in this Travel Plan.
Philip Saccoccia		772	Belgrade	A proposed connector motorcycle route to be constructed up Johnson Canyon Trail #5Uses: Motorized (General) from the Foothills Trail over Ross Pass is a gross mistake. This area is too steep	West Bridger South	The preferred alternative would not construct any motorized connector trails from Johnson Canyon to Ross Pass. The Corbly Gulch Trail, and a portion of the Foothills Trail #534 would be open to motorcycles from

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				and fragile and will be ruined by motorized use.		June 15 - October 15. In the preferred alternative we are also contemplating a "time share" proposal on the motorcycle trails in the southern portion of the Bridgers. Under this scenario, on certain days during the open season for motorized use, these trails would be manage for non-motorized recreation. Please see the Record of Decision for more discussion on "time shared" trails.
Anne Banks	BWAGS	1177	Bozeman	ATV Travel in Johnson Canyon may conflict with road use allowed for passenger cars and encouraged for 4x4s. There will be a temptation for motorcycle trespass into Upper Mill Creek (Quagle Creek?) drainage and from there to upper North Cottonwood. There is already on-the-ground evidence of this use.	West Bridgers North	The preferred alternative proposes to manage the road system in Johnson canyon as a low standard road designed for 4x4 high clearance vehicles, and as an ATV trail. The travel plan decision will restrict all motor vehicle use to designated routes, which should help with any confusion about permissible riding areas. There are no motorized trails proposed in North Cottonwood or Quagle Creek.
Jon Schwedler		1126	Bozeman	Motorcycle use along the Bridger trails on the west side not only allows too much erosion given the slope of the trail in places, but it is unsafe. That trail is used by way too many people with children to responsibly allow motorcycles to be ripping along that trail. I've witnessed too many near-accidents with motorcycles on that trail.	West Bridgers North	Non-motorized management of trails in the south west portion of the Bridgers was considered in alternatives 5 and 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, Corbly) from June 15 - October 15. Additionally we are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.
Timothy L. Ravndal	Montana Multiple Use Association, Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1032		The Johnson-Flathead-Grouse trail has not been identified even though it has existed for years. Although these are relatively short trails, they are very important to 4x4 recreationists and there are no other substitutes.	West Bridgers North	The preferred alternative proposes to manage an ATV trail system which would connect Johnson-Grouse Creek areas. Please see the summer motorized map for Alternative 7M.
Tom Stonecipher		525	Bozeman	My comments about the Plan deal specifically with the Bridger Mountains, the west side, and the Forest Service trails running from the "M" to Fairy Lake and those for Sypes Canyon, Middle Cottonwood, Truman Gulch, and Corbly Creek. I understand that the current proposal calls for dirt bike use and motorcycle use to be emphasized on those trails. I ask that you reconsider that decision for the following reasons. The trails themselves were not built for motorized travel and are poor avenues for that travel at best. However, there are flats, meadows, and	West Bridgers North	Non-motorized management of trails in the south west portion of the Bridgers was considered in alternatives 5 and 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, Corbly) from June 15 - October 15. Additionally we are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				similar areas adjacent to these trails which will be tremendous temptations for off-road travel and which will not be able to support it without suffering significant damage. There are wetlands, springs, creeks, and general damp lands and meadows all along the M to Fairy Lake Trail which will suffer irreparable damage...from motorized traffic.		
Kenneth L. Hasting		549	Bozeman	1. Trail trenching and erosion. …The hiking trails which have no access for motorized vehicles were easy albeit steep paths "hiking width wide" with no signs of erosion. Once I reached the north-south "High Trail" I had trouble hiking. The imprints of motorbike tires, about 3-4" wide shoed in the trench cut in the center of the trail, a narrow trench that made it virtually impossible to walk in the trail and maintain secure footing. This forces us hikers to develop a secondary trail next to the main trail, a degradation of the land we're trying to preserve. In several steep areas, the bide "gouges were visible in several parallel trails as the bikes must have struggled to "dig in" and get traction. This trail degradation and erosion is very visible on the part that I hiked from Ross Pass south to Jones Canyon.	West Bridgers North	Thank you for your comment about these trails in the Bridgers. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
Kathryn Hiestand and Neal Miller		337		In the West Bridgers, we use the Foothills Trail, and Middle and North Cottonwood trails. We feel very strongly that motorcycles would be very inappropriate for Middle Cottonwood. The trail is narrow and brushy in places. We feel that motorcycles would cause erosion along the river and on steep hills, as well as spoiled the solitude of this lovely Canyon.	West Bridgers North	Non-motorized management of trails in the western portion of the Bridgers was considered in alternatives 5 and 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, Corbly) from June 15 - October 15. Additionally we are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301	Bozeman	Bridger Mountains: the West Bridger's north travel plan has a proposed motorcycle connector between trail 6931 and trail 2514, the upper and lower parts of Johnson Canyon. We believe this is a bad idea because the area contains rugged terrain and is heavily wooded.	West Bridgers North	These routes you mention are actually roads, not trails. The preferred alternative does propose to manage several ATV trails and sections of these roads for 4x4 high clearance vehicles in the Johnson Canyon/Grouse Creek Area. We believe this area can be managed for a small ATV loop trail system without undue resource effects. Please see the summer motorized maps for the proposed configuration.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Greg Beardslee		737		Also a long the foothills trail, how about acknowledging the existence of the connector trail through North Cottonwood to Johnson Canyon? My friends have been riding it for years (on mountain bikes).	West Bridgers North	Alternative 3 considered constructing a connector trail between North Cottonwood and Johnson Canyon. The preferred alternative would not construct this route, to maintain more primitive backcountry dispersed recreation opportunities.
Loren Blanksma		1194		When I rode this area, I was unable to find the Gallop trail, therefore I do not object to closing it to motorcycles. It would however, if it existed, provide a good motorized opportunity in this area.	West Bridgers North	The Gallop Trail #528 is currently in disrepair. The Travel Plan's objective is to bring this trail back to life and open it to motorized uses. This would help to connect the motorized uses in Johnson Canyon to Felix Canyon.
Patricia Dowd		1261	Bozeman	The West Bridgers North has a proposed motorcycle connector - the FS should not create a new trail in this rugged country.	West Bridgers North	This connector trail was considered in Alternative 3, it is not proposed in the preferred Alternative 7M.
Todd Orr		840		544 - Corbly - Suggest managing right fork as closed to motorized use at the fork with the single track trail to the north, to prevent resource damage, erosion and possible further extension of trail.	West Bridgers North	Trail #544 in Corbly Gulch is proposed in the preferred alternative to be managed for foot, stock, mountain bikes and motorcycles. Only one route would be managed in the preferred alternative. Please see the Record of Decision for more discussions on the rationale for managing trails within Corbly Gulch.
Todd Orr		840		528 - Flathead Pass Creek road 6931 to Felix road 2514 - Suggest signing and closing trail motorized use due to steep, gravelly, dangerous hill climb with high erosion and high possibility of an accident occurring.	West Bridgers North	The Flathead Pass road is a county road and outside of our jurisdiction to manage.
Gary and Randell Pates	Pates Enterprises	247	Billings	We would like to recommend an alternate route, Road #6931, the Flathead Pass County Road. The public has already been accessing, the Johnson Canyon road network even though it is not designated on your current maps. We believe you will find that with a minimal amount of access improvement to this unmapped connection, your existing Johnson Canyon road network will be easily accessible to the public. We think the best long term solution to meet the public's recreational access needs, alleviate private property damage as well as minimize on-going forest service costs to maintain roads on private lands would be to utilize the Flathead Pass county road # 6931. After all, there would be no longer any need to maintain these 2 miles of private road.	West Bridgers North	We considered this alternative, but not in detail. The preferred alternative would continue to provide passenger car access to Johnson Canyon on road #2512, and an ATV connector trail from the Felix/Grouse Creek Area. This does not preclude this alternative be considered in the future if there is a positive benefit to the public and the local landowners.
Jennifer Allain		875	Bozeman	Truman Gulch: Access to this trailhead is over a poorly maintained road. The condition of the road can hardly handle current user volume. Both the	West Bridgers South	The Truman Gulch access road is managed by the county and not within our maintenance jurisdiction. Seasonal restrictions are proposed for the Truman Gulch

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				road and trail tend to be wet much later in the year than other nearby trails. Most of the trail is shaded throughout the growing season, keeping parts wet and easily damaged.		trail for motorized uses to help protect the trail during spring mud seasons.
Robert Boik		887	Bozeman	I frequently hike and snowshoe the Bridgers foothills trail from the M to Baldy 20-30 times/year for the last 12 yrs. This trail is used by motorcycles a few times/year, but b/c of the steepness of the trail the consequences of this use is quite evident. A single motorcycle in a single day can cause more damage that I have caused in hundreds of hikes.	West Bridgers South	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Kris Hall		921	Bozeman	We live at the base of Middle Cottonwood trail. We have enjoyed hiking and x-c skiing from our home. We have noticed trails that have endured significant erosion this year, perhaps due to more rain. We are very concerned about motorized vehicles causing much more erosion than already exists. I stopped riding my horse up the road completely after close calls where ATVs and motorcycles raced so quickly upon us.	West Bridgers South	Non-motorized management of trails in the western portion of the Bridgers was considered in alternatives 5 and 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, Corbly) from June 15 - October 15. Additionally we are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.
Gillian Howe		931		The topography of the West Bridgers consists of narrow, steep trails; they cannot support motorized usage. Hunting, hiking and horseback riding has caused enough damage w/ fires alone. The current budget does not support the historic lack of enforcement. Increased motorization will lead to permanent damage of wildlife and ecosystems.	West Bridgers South	Non-motorized management of trails in the western portion of the Bridgers was considered in alternatives 5 and 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, Corbly) from June 15 - October 15. Additionally we are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.
Anne Johnson		934	Bozeman	The M trail is currently a motorized trail, though not often used that way. I fear that once other trails are closed to motorized users that this neighborhood system of trails will see more motorized use. That would present not only safety problems for families but for motor-riders as the terrain at the north end is not well-suited for dirt bikes in places.	West Bridgers South	In the preferred alternative, the "M" trail and the Bridger Foothills trail from the "M" parking lot to it's junction with the Middle Cottonwood trail would be managed for non-motorized use. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, Corbly) from June 15 - October 15. Additionally we are considering a

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						"time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.
Michael Lebwohl		943	Gallatin Gateway	Trails like Corbly Gulch and Middle Cottonwood are too steep and narrow to be used by motorized w/out deterioration. These trails run along streams that contain trout populations. The stream crossings do not have bridges, which will lead to stream destruction and filtration in those places where the vehicles cross the streams.	West Bridgers South	Non-motorized management of trails in the western portion of the Bridgers was considered in alternatives 5 and 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, Corbly) from June 15 - October 15. Additionally we are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.
Stuart Jennings		1021	Bozeman	I have seen motorcycle riders riding out of Middle Cottonwood going north toward Bostwick cut all of the switchbacks, presumably due to the tight turning radius of the trail and not malice. Climbing out of Middle Cottonwood toward Sypes is a steep and wet section of trail marginally rideable on motorcycle. This section is torn up by spinning motorcycle wheels creating a mud hole.	West Bridgers South	Thank you for this comment about Trail #586. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
Rick Meis		1030	Bozeman	The upper parts of the Middle Cottonwood trail #534 are showing rapid deterioration and motorcycles are the most significant part of this due to the pounds per square inch and the rut a tire makes as well as the misuse of power by spinning out or skidding as they do on steep trails.	West Bridgers South	Thank you for this comment about Trail #534. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
Anne Banks	BWAGS	1177	Bozeman	On Corbley Gulch trail # 544, Truman Gulch Trail # 535, Middle Cottonwood Trail # 586 and Foothills Trail # 534 connecting them, motorcycle, mountain biking, stock and foot use are emphasized from mid-July to early-September. This combination of uses on popular trails will create dangerous user conflict and safety issues. The trails are steep, narrow, rocky and easily eroded.	West Bridgers South	Many users have shared concern about the proposed alternative 7 configuration mixing uses on these popular trails. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, Corbly) from June 15 - October 15. Additionally we are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Baldy Mountain Trail: user created trail in use from the early 1970s from trail 534. Starts in Sypes Canyon Drainage between trails 531 and 586 and ends on ridge at Baldy Mountain.	West Bridgers South	We are aware of this user created route, but are not considering adding it to the trail system in any alternative. The route is very steep, and would not be easily reconstructed to meet minimal trail standards for any use.
Todd Hoitsma		1340		Middle Cottonwood: many of the steep switchbacks are now eroded in narrow gulches the width of dirt bike tire tracks. More wet meadow damage on trail up towards steepest switchbacks.	West Bridgers South	Thank you for this comment about Trail #586. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
Bernice Burns		483	Bozeman	Specifically I am concerned about Trail #586, the Middle Cottonwood Creek Trail. The trail is narrow. If a motorcycle goes by there is not much room to step off the trail. It would be extremely hazardous to try to dodge motorcycles.	West Bridgers South	Non-motorized management of trails in the western portion of the Bridgers was considered in alternatives 5 and 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, Corbly) from June 15 - October 15. Additionally we are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.
Jack Burns		484	Bozeman	You are urged (requested) to limit the Middle Cottonwood Trail (#586) to non-motorized use. We hiked the trail last week and it is not safe for motorized vehicle use. The sight distance and width of the trail is not enough for safe use by motors.	West Bridgers South	Non-motorized management of trails in the western portion of the Bridgers was considered in alternatives 5 and 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, Corbly) from June 15 - October 15. Additionally we are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.
Greg Beardslee		737		I would hope in the future that Middle Cottonwood and Lyman Creek portions of the Foothills trail get rerouted in order to be safe for all people using them.	West Bridgers South	Thank you for this comment about Trail #586. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Jones Creek Trail #533 and Bostwick Canyon Trail #536, though shown as motor free trails in the DEIS, should not be considered in any overview of compilation of opportunities because they are not legally accessible from the west.	West Bridgers South	We understand your concern about easy public access from the road system, however, these trails can be accessed from the Bridger Foothills Trail #534 and will be maintained on the trail inventory in the preferred alternative. We have identified an objective to obtain public access to the Bostwick trail system in the preferred alternative. Please see Chapter I of the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for a complete list of proposed access needs.
Greg Beardslee		737		On sustainable grade trails, motorcycles leave a light footprint. I would hope in the future both Middle Cottonwood and Lyman Creek portions of the Foothills trail get rerouted in order to be safe for all people using them.	West Bridgers South	Thank you for this comment about Trail #586. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
Elena and Gary Bohannan		346	Bozeman	We very much want the FS to reclaim the Bostwick trailhead with a prescriptive easement or eminent domain proceeding as was done on John Brown's property for the Middle Cottonwood trail access.	West Bridgers South	We have identified an objective to obtain public access to the Bostwick trail system in the preferred alternative. Please see Chapter I of the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for a complete list of proposed access needs.
Loren Blanksma		1194		As near as I could tell, Jones Creek trail (533) and Bostwick trail (536) no longer exist and thus could be eliminated completely from the travel map.	West Bridgers South	We understand your concern about the difficulty in locating these lightly used routes however, these trails can be accessed from the Bridger Foothills Trail #534 and will be maintained on the trail inventory in the preferred alternative. We have identified an objective to obtain public access to the Bostwick trail system in the preferred alternative. Please see Chapter I of the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for a complete list of proposed access needs.
Andy Copeland		1245		Create a connecting route from Foothills Trail 534 to East side trail 538 south of Baldy Mountain for mountain biking.	West Bridgers South	While this proposal has merit - the DEIS did not consider any new route connectors in this area for the public to comment on because we were not made aware of the proposal in time to add it to any alternative. Therefore this route is not considered in any alternative in the FEIS. There are several existing connectors between the east and west side of the Bridgers further north (Ross Pass and trail 534 at Fairy Lake). The preferred alternative also identifies an access objective in the Pine Creek area to provide public access to the southern portion of the Slushman's trail system.
Andy Copeland		1245		Ensure the proposed route from trail 534 to Johnson Canyon can connect to Pass Creek Road/Flathead Pass route.	West Bridgers South	In the preferred alternative, there is no proposed connector between Trail #534 and Johnson Canyon.
Todd Orr		840		Sypes/Baldy: This trail shows signs of being in existence for at least 10 years or more. I determined this by studying old sections of the trail with layers of decaying deadfall accumulating for years. Suggest minimal trail work needed to prevent further damage on hill climb section.	West Bridgers South	We are aware of this user created route, but are not considering adding it to the trail system in any alternative. The route is very steep, and would not be easily reconstructed to meet minimal trail standards for any use.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Scott Bosse		130	Bozeman	Close Middle Cottonwood to all motorized travel. The Middle cottonwood trailhead is the only trailhead on the west side of the Bridger's close to town that is easily accessible to hikers that travel by car to the trailhead. Sypes Canyon is also accessible, but it is extremely crowded and there is no water during most of the summer and fall. Both Truman Gulch and Corbly Gulch are impassible to 90% of vehicles due to there deeps ruts, large rocks and frequent mud. Therefore, they should be open to motorized users who can make it to the trailhead without many problems.	West Bridgers South	Non-motorized management of trails in the western portion of the Bridgers was considered in alternatives 5 and 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, Corbly) from June 15 - October 15. Additionally we are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.
Loren Blanksma		1194		Also, there is a road past Aldridge Lake that appeared to be closed when I was there, but it shows on the current map as being open. The FS should try to protect these local roads so as to maintain some serviceability to FS land in the vicinity.	Yankee Jim Canyon	Forest records indicate that this road is an old County Road with the termini shown. Additional discussions are necessary with Park County to validate these termini. Any records made available in the future that would help to clarify this issue will be considered.
Kathleen A. Gordon	The eSummit Lighthouse and Church Universal and Triumphant	1236		Trail 175 - the agency's continued depiction of trail 175 beyond the locked gate in section 9 across the private road in sections 9 and 10 in the Mol Heron Creek area demonstrates a flagrant disregard for our private property rights, misleads the public, encourages trespass and is intolerable.	Yankee Jim Canyon	The Forest asserts that the Forest and the public have enjoyed the right to use this National Forest Trail (even though recently disputed) for many decades. While recorded (writtten) easements don't exist for all segments of the trail across private land, the Forest asserts it's historic rights to show this trail as an administrative and public trail as depicted.
Kathleen A. Gordon	The eSummit Lighthouse and Church Universal and Triumphant	1236		Devils Slide/Aldridge Lake Road - The property in Section 1 (T9S R7E) is owned by the RTR and is not subject to public use. We will continue to enforce against trespassers and object to any depiction of FS management of that portion of the road on RTR private property.	Yankee Jim Canyon	Forest records indicate that this road is an old County Road with the termini shown. Additional discussions are necessary with Park County to validate these termini. Any records made available in the future that would help to clarify this issue will be considered.
Kathleen A. Gordon	The eSummit Lighthouse and Church Universal and Triumphant	1236		Mol Heron/Aldridge Lake Road - This comment refers to the road which leaves Mol Heron Creek Road in Section 35 an crosses Section 35 and 36. The FS has no authority to manage this private road. This depiction is not accurate and should be removed.	Yankee Jim Canyon	Forest records indicate that this road is a County Road with the termini shown. Additional discussions are necessary with Park County to validate these termini. Any records made available in the future that would help to clarify this issue will be considered.
Kathleen A. Gordon	The eSummit Lighthouse and Church Universal and Triumphant	1236		Mol Heron Creek Road - The public should be accurately informed that beyond Section 34 there is no access to FS land. Moreover, the FS designation is directly opposite to Plan guideline B-3 which directs the agency to protect the jurisdictional status of roads and trails.	Yankee Jim Canyon	Forest records indicate that this road is a County Road with the termini shown. Additional discussions are necessary with Park County to validate these termini. Any records made available in the future that would help to clarify this issue will be considered.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Kathleen A. Gordon	The eSummit Lighthouse and Church Universal and Triumphant	1236		Beattie Gulch Trail - The draft alternatives in the Plan continue to show the access road to the Forbes cabin from the trail around the cabin in Section 11 (T9S R7#). We recently became aware that the FS has erected a sign on the Beattie Bulch Road characterizing this route as "Access to Cabin". These depictions are inaccurate, inconsistent with the RTR easement and should be removed.	Yankee Jim Canyon	Forest records indicate that this road is an administrative National Forest Road with a written road easement to cross this property. The public, by virtue of a written trail easement, is allowed to use road for trail uses. We believe the map accurately depicts the correct management of the road and trail.
David Molebash	Montana Ranch Company	677		Trail #182 (Pole Gulch Trail) runs from the lower end of 8 mile creek across Ken Wilson's Ranch, up into section 1 and 13 on Montana Ranch Company Lands, across Pole Gulch where it enters land owned by the Story Ranch. None of this trail is visible or marked to my knowledge and there is no legal access across these private lands. My greatest concern is that if this trail is placed on a map that shows it is open for foot or stock travel, the public will try to travel it and could face prosecution for trespass on private land. While I understand the FS desire to claim historic rights on all trails that were ever used in the area, I do not feel that the public should be put at risk to establish these claims.	Yellowstone	As mentioned, the Forest does claim historic rights on this trail. The Travel Plan identifies the desired future objective for this trail. The Forest intends to do heavy maintenance on this trail as soon as the funds are available.
David Molebash	Montana Ranch Company	677		Trail #146 across Sections 5 & 9 of Montana Ranch Company lands at or near Mud Lake. There is currently no legal access across these sections and any maps should clearly show this.	Yellowstone	The Forest asserts that the Forest and the public have enjoyed the right to use this National Forest Trail for many decades. While recorded (writtten) easements don't exist for all segments of this trail across private land, the Forest asserts it's historic rights to show this trail as an administrative and public trail as depicted.
David Molebash	Montana Ranch Company	677		Trail #240 across the Story Ranch up Fridely Creek. There is currently no legal access up this trail to my knowledge, and any future maps should reflect this.	Yellowstone	The Forest asserts that the Forest and the public have enjoyed the right to use this National Forest Trail for many decades. While recorded (writtten) easements don't exist for all segments of this trail across private land, the Forest asserts it's historic rights to show this trail as an administrative and public trail as depicted.
Scott and Deborah Brown		220	Bozeman	Bear Canyon trail systems have greatly suffered and are in poor condition. The clay and unstable soils are rutted from the wear and tear of vehicles, including Mountain bikes, and it will take many years to help them recover.	Bear Canyon	Bear Creek (Bear Canyon) sediment loading is naturally high due to erosive soils and stream banks but is accelerated by motorized trail use to the Forest boundary. Below the Forest boundary, the Bear Canyon trail is close to Bear Creek with several direct snowmelt and storm flow discharge points directly into Bear Creek. The Gallatin NF in cooperation with Montana DNRC and Montana DEQ will be conducting rehabilitation actions at 13 problem areas in lower Bear Canyon in 2006. The

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						rehabilitation work is designed to reduce sediment loading to Bear Creek and includes slump stabilization, additional cross drains, trail in-sloping, turnpike and ditching, rock barricade a segment of Bear Creek which ATV's drive into, additional culverts, and elevate bridge fill on the Trail # 440 bridge across Bear Creek. Long term actions will require closing Bear Creek and Bear Canyon to motorized use until the entire trail system is improved to a stable condition which can withstand ATV and motorcycle use. Parts of the lower section of Bear Canyon, primarily on Montana DNRC lands in the vicinity of the 2 Bear Creek fords, can be located to east of Bear Creek to avoid 2 of the fords and the west side natural slump.
Thomas Pick		329	Bozeman	Specifically, I agree with the recommendations for Bear Canyon because of the clay and wet soils in this area. The seasonal closures on motorized and mountain bike use should help to reduce erosion and sedimentation to the streams. I would like to suggest that the 300 foot off trail variance in effect in this area be applied forest wide. Too many trails have become excessively widened by establishment of secondary routes, particularly by ATVs.	Bear Canyon	Bear Creek (Bear Canyon) sediment loading is naturally high due to erosive soils and stream banks but is accelerated by motorized trail use to the Forest boundary. Below the Forest boundary, the Bear Canyon trail is close to Bear Creek with several direct snowmelt and storm flow discharge points directly into Bear Creek. The Gallatin NF in cooperation with Montana DNRC and Montana DEQ will be conducting rehabilitation actions at 13 problem areas in lower Bear Canyon in 2006. The rehabilitation work is designed to reduce sediment loading to Bear Creek and includes slump stabilization, additional cross drains, trail in-sloping, turnpike and ditching, rock barricade a segment of Bear Creek which ATV's drive into, additional culverts, and elevate bridge fill on the Trail # 440 bridge across Bear Creek. Long term actions will require closing Bear Creek and Bear Canyon to motorized use until the entire trail system is improved to a stable condition which can withstand ATV and motorcycle use. Parts of the lower section of Bear Canyon, primarily on Montana DNRC lands in the vicinity of the 2 Bear Creek fords, can be located to east of Bear Creek to avoid 2 of the fords and the west side natural slump.
Tom Pick		329	Bozeman	Specifically, I agree with the recommendations for Bear Canyon because of the clayey, wet soils in this area. The seasonal closures on motorized and mtn bike use should help to reduce erosion and sedimentation to the streams. I'd like to suggest that the 300 foot off trail variance in effect in this area be	Bear Canyon	Bear Creek (Bear Canyon) sediment loading is naturally high due to erosive soils and stream banks but is accelerated by motorized trail use to the Forest boundary. Below the Forest boundary, the Bear Canyon trail is close to Bear Creek with several direct snowmelt and storm flow discharge points directly into Bear Creek.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				applied forest wide. Too many trails have become excessively widened by establishment of secondary routes, particularly by ATVs.		The Gallatin NF in cooperation with Montana DNRC and Montana DEQ will be conducting rehabilitation actions at 13 problem areas in lower Bear Canyon in 2006. The rehabilitation work is designed to reduce sediment loading to Bear Creek and includes slump stabilization, additional cross drains, trail in-sloping, turnpike and ditching, rock barricade a segment of Bear Creek which ATV's drive into, additional culverts, and elevate bridge fill on the Trail # 440 bridge across Bear Creek. Long term actions will require closing Bear Creek and Bear Canyon to motorized use until the entire trail system is improved to a stable condition which can withstand ATV and motorcycle use. Parts of the lower section of Bear Canyon, primarily on Montana DNRC lands in the vicinity of the 2 Bear Creek fords, can be located to east of Bear Creek to avoid 2 of the fords and the west side natural slump.
Carole Mackin	Department of Environmental Quality, Nonpoint Source Program	371		Issue 20: Watershed management (Water Quality) in the Summary and Chapter 2 Alternatives has an inconsistency between the text and Table. The Text says "The largest change due to travel management is in non-motorized trail sediment which increases from an estimated 68 tons/year in Alternative 1 to 84 tons/year in Alternative 7..... However, the table says that Non-Motor Trail Sediment ton/yr in Alt 7 is 82.	Issues	This DEIS contains revised sediment analysis for Alternative 7 which is 73 tons/year of sediment for non-motorized trails. See Issue 20, Tables 3.20.9 and 3.20.10.
Carole Mackin	Department of Environmental Quality, Nonpoint Source Program	371		the expected decrease in sediment yield over natural conditions is important to sustain the beneficial uses of the water. However, two Travel Planning Areas may see an increase in sediment: Bangtails and Big Sky. It is important to assure that management activities do not make conditions worse in these streams.	Issues	The Gallatin NF is planning to decommission about 46.6 miles of roads in the Bangtail TPA to reduce sediment. In addition about 1.2 miles user-built trails not part of the Gallatin National Forest transportation system or those not planned to be part of the trail system in the Travel Plan would be obliterated. The objectives include improve the infiltration of water into road surfaces to reduce the water channeling effect of roads, remove culverts and restore the natural channel characteristics where roads cross streams, reduce sediment transport from road surfaces directly into streams, and facilitate the growth of vegetation on road surfaces. Detailed maps of the project area available for review at the Bozeman Ranger District Office. The project is anticipitated to reduce the estimated sediment in the Bangtails from the 35.37% over natural shown in the DEIS for alternative 1 to 25.04% over natural for

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Alterative 1 in the FEIS. The work is focused Bangtail Creek, Willow Creek, Perkins Creek, and Jackson Creek with a goal of reducing sediment to Yellowstone Cutthroat fisheries. See the Direct and Indirect Effects section of issue 20 (Watershed Management).
Carole Mackin	Department of Environmental Quality, Nonpoint Source Program	371		Please list the RLSWCP that the FS proposes to mitigate potential impacts. For instance, in Big Sky, the FS may want to coordinate with the Blue Water Task Force or other watershed groups who are working on sediment issues.	Issues	The Big Sky TPA has the highest % over natural sediment of any of the travel planning areas due primarily to extensive development on private land over which the Gallatin NF does not have jurisdiction. In the SE part of the Big Sky TPA approximately 6 miles of project roads (marked in green on the maps) could be obliterated. The GNF is planning to develop a programmatic NEPA document after the Travel Plan decision to decommission many of the project (green) roads. The main change on National Forest lands in the Big Sky TPA is construction of the ATV/motorcycle connector from the Buck Ridge Trail into the Yellowmule drainages as a replacement opportunity for eliminating motorized use on the Buck Creek trail. The Gallatin NF is closely coordinating with the Montana DEQ on development of the Upper Gallatin TMDL (scheduled for 2007) and the ONRW EIS, currently being developed. In the past the GNF has coordinated water quality monitoring and data sharing with the Blue Water Task force and initiated a water quality monitoring network in 2004 and 2005 on 4 Gallatin River watershed sites to obtain much needed suspended and bedload sediment, turbidity, and discharge data. The GNF has coordinated with the Montana DEQ to provide the raw data and report on the Montana DEQ FTP site.
Noreen Breeding		454		Trail #188: This winter snowmobile route should not have ATV traffic on it, unless it is rerouted off the stream bank. Near where it intersects trail #186, it is located within inches of Swan Creek, severely damaging the bank and degrading the river.	Gallatin Roaded	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. This trail in the Gallatin Roaded TPA has facility/maintenance needs that will be addressed in future decisions. Trail #188 is shared by summer motorized use and is also used by snowmobiles in the winter. The trail definitely needs tread work and more separation from Swan Creek.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency	587		All roads/trails within the Middle Fork and North Fork Willow and Bangtail Creek drainages should be closed until road restoration, stabilization improvements result in reduced sediment delivery.	Bangtails	The Gallatin NF is planning to decommission about 46.6 miles of roads in the Bangtail TPA to reduce sediment. In addition about 1.2 miles user-built trails not part of the Gallatin National Forest transportation system or those

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Region 8, Montana Office			Many abandoned road crossings are poorly restored and need stabilization, and 12 miles of road need obliteration.		not planned to be part of the trail system in the Travel Plan would be obliterated. The objectives include improve the infiltration of water into road surfaces to reduce the water channeling effect of roads, remove culverts and restore the natural channel characteristics where roads cross streams, reduce sediment transport from road surfaces directly into streams, and facilitate the growth of vegetation on road surfaces. Detailed maps of the project area available for review at the Bozeman Ranger District Office. The project is anticipitated to reduce the estimated sediment in the Bangtails from the 35.37% over natural shown in the DEIS for alternative 1 to 25.04% over natural for Alterative 1 in the FEIS. The work is focused Bangtail Creek, Willow Creek, Perkins Creek, and Jackson Creek with a goal of reducing sediment to Yellowstone Cutthroat fisheries. Any additional ATV construction would not be completed until the road decommissioning work is completed See the Direct and Indirect Effects section of issue 20 (Watershed Management).
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Trail 440 in Bear Canyon TPA should be closed until road restoration, stabilization improvements result in reduced sediment delivery.	Bear Canyon	Bear Creek (Bear Canyon) sediment loading is naturally high due to erosive soils and stream banks but is accelerated by motorized trail use to the Forest boundary. Below the Forest boundary, the Bear Canyon trail is close to Bear Creek with several direct snowmelt and storm flow discharge points directly into Bear Creek. The Gallatin NF in cooperation with Montana DNRC and Montana DEQ will be conducting rehabilitation actions at 13 problem areas in lower Bear Canyon in 2006. The rehabilitation work is designed to reduce sediment loading to Bear Creek and includes slump stabilization, additional cross drains, trail in-sloping, turnpike and ditching, rock barricade a segment of Bear Creek which ATV's drive into, additional culverts, and elevate bridge fill on the Trail # 440 bridge across Bear Creek. Long term actions will require closing Bear Creek and Bear Canyon to motorized use until the entire trail system is improved to a stable condition which can withstand ATV and motorcycle use. Parts of the lower section of Bear Canyon, primarily on Montana DNRC lands in the vicinity of the 2 Bear Creek fords, can be located to east of Bear Creek to avoid 2 of the fords and the west side natural slump.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Stream crossing on South Fork Shields #265 needs improved drainage and tributary crossings to reduce sediment delivery and Cottonwood Lake #197 to junction #270 needs trail improvements and rerouting around meadows.	East Crazies	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. These trails in the Shields drainage have facility/maintenance needs that will be addressed in future decisions.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		We also suggest that the GNF consider additional management direction to further assure reduced adverse effects to water quality and fisheries from roads. Some suggestions for additional and/or supplemental management direction include: Revised Objective C-1 to include consideration for closing and rehabilitating roads where they may be causing resource damage; and Add a guideline for Objective C.1, to, "Leave culverts or other crossing structures on closed or decommissioned roads, only when they can be maintained on a regular basis to minimize or prevent the risk of failure and associated resource damage.	Goals and Objectives	Additional management direction to reduce road source sediment was added under several of the standards in Goal M in Chapter 1.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		South Fork Shields #265, Trespass #268 needs stream crossing and trail drainage improvements to mitigate sediment impacts.	Ibex	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. These trails in the Shields drainage have facility/maintenance needs that will be addressed in future decisions.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587	Helena	The EPA believes road and trail networks, should be limited to those that can be adequately maintained within agency budgets and capabilities. We are concerned that there is often inadequate funding and resources to properly maintain roads and keep them in fair to good condition, and to keep them from delivering excess sediment to area streams. We encourage the FS to incorporate as much road rehabilitation and road closure an decommissioning as possible in its preferred alternative. Efforts to improve road conditions and reduce sediment delivery from roads should be a major element of the Travel Plan.	Issues	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. The GNF is planning to develop a programmatic NEPA document after the Travel Plan decision to decommission many of the project (green) roads. The GNF has obliterated over 300 miles of roads since 1989 (about 15% of the roads on NF lands) and anticipates that completion of the travel plan will provide additional emphasis on trail and road maintenance and road decommissioning.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection	587		We found it difficult to assess if the proposed travel management plan is consistent with TMDLs and water quality restoration strategies that are being	Issues	The Gallatin has been closely coordinating TMDL development with the Montana DEQ and EPA for completed TMDL's (Cooke City), ongoing (Shields,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Agency Region 8, Montana Office			developed for impaired waters in all Gallatin TPAs. We encourage the GNF to coordinate their travel management planning with Montana DEQ as well as EPA TMDL staff to assure travel plan consistency with TMDLs and water quality restoration plans being prepared by MDEQ and/or EPA.		Boulder Big Timber, Shields), and future TMDL's (notably Paradise, Upper Gallatin, East Gallatin, and the Upper Madison TMDL's). The GNF has written the 4B analysis for Taylor Fork and Cache Creek, and is an active participant in the Gallatin River ONRW EIS. A more complete description of the TMDL process, and GNF involvement is contained in Issue #20 Watershed Management (Water Quality)
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Since much of the DEIS watershed analysis identifies sediment yields and levels by TPA, it would be helpful in the FPA in which each of the impaired streams is located within could be identified to facilitate evaluation of the effect of travel management alternatives on these impaired waters.	Issues	Gallatin NF streams which are impaired on the 2004 Montana Water Quality Integrated Report, 2002 303(d) list, or 1996 303(d) list are discussed in issue #20 in the Water Quality Limited Segments and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) section.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		It is not clear how Table 3.20.11 "Optimal Substrate Sediment and Sediment Yield Percent Over Natural Linked to Management Objectives" (page 3-427) was developed. We are particularly interested in the basis for establishing the proposed percentages for annually % > natural sediment yield Category A and B streams. An expanded table on this topic is shown as Table I-4 (page I-13), that also includes a 20 year cumulative %>natural sediment yield. We are also interested in understanding the basis for this 20 year cumulative %>natural sediment yield figure in Table I-4.	Issues	The annual % > natural sediment yield column is the maximum percentage of sediment increase above natural which can be delivered to a stream channel at specified critical reach and still meet management objectives for a given stream category. The R1R4 model approximates sediment delivery (assuming average annual precipitation) at a critical reach by applying a channel sediment routing coefficient. The coefficient accounts for temporary in channel storage of sediment in stream channel systems between the upper end of a watershed and the critical reach accounting point in the stream system where the R1R4 model is run. Larger watersheds have a smaller channel sediment routing coefficient number since the distance between the upper part of the watershed and the critical reach is larger. The percentages were derived from regressions on GNF streams of fine <6.3mm (from upper 4" sediment cores in spawning gravels) versus % >natural sediment yield modeling results. The R1R4 model was run for the watershed above the coring site critical reaches accounting for all activity (roads, timber harvest, fires, mining, and buildings/clearings). Note that the Category A and B streams are directly linked to fish management objectives, fish substrate information, and regression analysis for GNF data. The 20 year cumulative component was dropped in lieu of the updated Goal M - Standard M-1 in issue #20 Watershed Management (Water Quality)

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Increased snowmobile pollutant emissions could be particularly problematic in areas where snowmobiles congregate (e.g. trailheads) and during short periods of poor air dispersion (e.g., valleys where frequent inversion conditions may trap air pollutants). In general, snowmobile emissions are worst when the engine is first started and hasn't yet warmed. For this reason trailheads are areas where this concern is greatest. If there are heavily used trailheads, the Forest should consider placing signs or implementing patrols on heavy use mornings to encourage users to limit idling time. The EPA also encourages use of the newer less polluting 4-stroke engine snowmobiles.	Issues	The 4 primary areas where snowmobile trailhead areas are most concentrated include West Yellowstone at the West Entrance, Bear Canyon trailhead, the Brackett Creek "Y", and the Carrot Basin trail head off Highway 191. Only the Brackett Creek "Y" is partially on the Gallatin NF. The NPS has documented greatly reduced particulate and carbon monoxide emission with 4 cycle snowmobile engines, particularly at the West Entrance and at Old Faithful. Placing addition warning signs or implementing patrols to encourage users to limit idling time will be considered in implementation of the Gallatin NF travel plan.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Air Quality Effects: The top paragraph of page 4-2 summarizes PM10 data from air monitoring stations in Bozeman and Belgrade from 1999 through June of 2000. More recent data and data from other air monitoring stations are now available. Please consider revising this paragraph to cover more recent data, as well as PM10 data from the Firehold station in West Yellowstone and PM2.5 data from stations at Bozeman and the west entrance of Yellowstone National Park.	Issues	These changes has been made as requested in issue #24 (Air Quality).
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Air Quality Effects: In the first paragraph following Table 4.24.1 (page 4-4), we suggest that "nitrous oxides" be revised to "nitrogen dioxide."	Issues	This change has been made as requested in issue #24 (Air Quality).
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Air Quality: The first sentence of the third paragraph of page 4-5 lists the pollutants for which NAAQS have been established. We suggest that this sentence be revised to include ozone and refer to "particulate matter" instead of "PM10". We recommend adding material to explain why particulate matter is the primary pollutant of concern. The final two sentences of the paragraph repeat information on the PM10 NAAQS from the preceding paragraph and could be deleted.	Issues	These changes has been made as requested in issue #24 (Air Quality).
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental	587		Meadows #167 needs rerouting to reduce sediment delivery.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office					and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. The Meadows # 167 trail several trail segments in need of additional maintenance and reconstruction. Completion of the travel plan is intended to provide additional emphasis on the backlog of trail maintenance needs. Some of those projects will require additional NEPA decisions.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Many roads in Shields TPA need surfacing and improved road drainage at locations with potential for sediment delivery to streams.	Shields	Sediment issues in the upper Shields River drainage are currently being worked on in the Shields River TMDL which will be completed in 2006. The Gallatin NF is currently actively working with Montana DEQ and consultants in completion of this plan which will address sediment issues on the roads, trails, and grazing allotments in the Upper Shields. Several Shields roads are in need of improved road drainage and spot surfacing, notably the Shields loop road #844 which has been on the GNF capitol investment inventory for surfacing for several years.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		North Dry Creek Road #2613 West needs improvements and seasonal restrictions from motorized use to reduce sediment delivery.	Yellowstone	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	Segment 1 of trail # 440 should be closed to motor vehicles in all alternatives. This would eliminate the three river crossings, unstable soils in the narrow canyon, and conflicts with Bear Canyon residents.	Bear Canyon	Bear Creek (Bear Canyon) sediment loading is naturally high due to erosive soils and stream banks but is accelerated by motorized trail use to the Forest boundary. Below the Forest boundary, the Bear Canyon trail is close to Bear Creek with several direct snowmelt and storm flow discharge points directly into Bear Creek. The Gallatin NF in cooperation with Montana DNRC and Montana DEQ will be conducting rehabilitation actions at 13 problem areas in lower Bear Canyon in 2006. The rehabilitation work is designed to reduce sediment loading to Bear Creek and includes slump stabilization, additional cross drains, trail in-sloping, turnpike and ditching, rock barricade a segment of Bear Creek which ATV's drive into, additional culverts, and elevate bridge fill on the Trail # 440 bridge across Bear Creek. Long term actions will require closing Bear Creek and Bear Canyon to motorized use until the entire trail system is improved to a stable condition which can withstand ATV

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						and motorcycle use. Parts of the lower section of Bear Canyon, primarily on Montana DNRC lands in the vicinity of the 2 Bear Creek fords, can be located to east of Bear Creek to avoid 2 of the fords and the west side natural slump.
Paul Griffin	Gallatin Wildlife Association	707		Bear Loop Trail #440 - close the segment to ATVs and motorcycles from Bear Canyon trailhead to junction with 440 loop near Bear Lakes. Bear Creek is on the TMDL water quality list. An additional reason for discontinuing ATV and motorcycle use is social conflict with the home owners as well as users of the New World gulch trail.	Bear Canyon	Bear Creek is not on the current Montana DEQ 303(d) list. Bear Creek, however, may be added in which case Bear Creek would be evaluated for TMDL's during the East Gallatin TMDL plan currently scheduled by Montana DEQ for 2008 to 20012. Bear Creek (Bear Canyon) sediment loading is naturally high due to erosive soils and stream banks but is accelerated by motorized trail use to the Forest boundary. Below the Forest boundary, the Bear Canyon trail is close to Bear Creek with several direct snowmelt and storm flow discharge points directly into Bear Creek. The Gallatin NF in cooperation with Montana DNRC and Montana DEQ will be conducting rehabilitation actions at 13 problem areas in lower Bear Canyon in 2006. The rehabilitation work is designed to reduce sediment loading to Bear Creek and includes slump stabilization, additional cross drains, trail in-sloping, turnpike and ditching, rock barricade a segment of Bear Creek which ATV's drive into, additional culverts, and elevate bridge fill on the Trail # 440 bridge across Bear Creek. Long term actions will require closing Bear Creek and Bear Canyon to motorized use until the entire trail system is improved to a stable condition which can withstand ATV and motorcycle use. Parts of the lower section of Bear Canyon, primarily on Montana DNRC lands in the vicinity of the 2 Bear Creek fords, can be located to east of Bear Creek to avoid 2 of the fords and the west side natural slump.
Mary Sadowski		773	Bozeman	…choose Goose Creek as the sole motorized access. Please consider these points: Goose Creek and Bridger Canyon Comparison: Distances to access points from Interstate 90 Interchange: To New World Gulch trailhead: 3.7 miles. To Goose Creek Trailhead: Analysis: Issues (General).6 miles. To proposed new parking area at FS boundary: 4.7 miles. If a new road is constructed at the Forest Service boundary then it's about 3.5 miles additional driving distance to access at Goose Creek than it	Bear Canyon	The Bear Canyon Task Force is considering the comments in your response. Bear Creek (Bear Canyon) sediment loading is naturally high due to erosive soils and stream banks but is accelerated by motorized trail use to the Forest boundary. Below the Forest boundary, the Bear Canyon trail is close to Bear Creek with several direct snowmelt and storm flow discharge points directly into Bear Creek. The Gallatin NF in cooperation with Montana DNRC and Montana DEQ will be conducting rehabilitation actions at 13 problem areas in lower Bear

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				would be at a new parking area further up Bear Canyon from the Bear Canyon Interchange. Reduce Impact and degradation of to the environment. Better utilize resource.... Reduce conflicts with New World Gulch motorized access. Minimize need for multi-agency jurisdiction. Reduce violations on DNRC lands. Create a wildlife corridor.		Canyon in 2006. The rehabilitation work is designed to reduce sediment loading to Bear Creek and includes slump stabilization, additional cross drains, trail in-sloping, turnpike and ditching, rock barricade a segment of Bear Creek which ATV's drive into, additional culverts, and elevate bridge fill on the Trail # 440 bridge across Bear Creek. Long term actions will require closing Bear Creek and Bear Canyon to motorized use until the entire trail system is improved to a stable condition which can withstand ATV and motorcycle use. Parts of the lower section of Bear Canyon, primarily on Montana DNRC lands in the vicinity of the 2 Bear Creek fords, can be located to east of Bear Creek to avoid 2 of the fords and the west side natural slump.
Todd Orr		840		Road 2512, 6930 - Johnson Canyon - Suggest signing and closing 4x4 road across Flathead Creek to prevent further stream bank erosion.	West Bridgers North	Alternative 7 includes closure of the 4X4 across Flathead Creek. The road is actually a user built jeep road.
Alan English	Gallatin Local Water Quality District	907	Bozeman	The GNF strongly consider potential water quality impacts w/in the GLWQD when making final decisions on the Travel Plan. The DEIS doesn't address the presence of GNF lands as recharge areas for the Gallatin Valley Aquifer system and the City Bzm water supply. The EIS and final travel plan should consider these two factors. There is no specific discussion of water quality monitoring within GNF lands. Establishment of a long-term water quality monitoring w/in GNF lands that includes baseline sampling under current conditions and sampling after implementation of the final travel plan should be considered.	Issues	Issue 20 Watershed Management in Chapter 3 was updated to include a brief discussion about GNF lands serving as recharge areas for the Gallatin aquifer system and also as recharge areas for the Bozeman municipal watersheds (Bozeman Creek and Hyalite Creek). The Gallatin established a long term water quality monitoring program in the 1970's, 1980's,and early 1900's. In recent years to Forest has refocused the water quality monitoring effort on more specific locations such as Hyalite Creek, Mill Creek, Bear Canyon, and the East Boulder River. In 2004 and 2005 a monitoring network was established on the Gallatin River to provide baseline sediment information for the ONRW EIS and upper Gallatin TMDL (targeted for 2007). Implementation of the travel plan is expected to slightly reduce overall sediment levels as disclosed in Issue 20 Watershed Management (Water Quality). Note Appendix B includes implementation monitoring, part of which will be to document compliance with water quality standards and guidelines.
Rick Meis		1030	Bozeman	In your description of the current conditions of the Taylor Fork area you do not address the existing problems w/ sedimentation and erosion that occurs in the Cache Creek/ Deadhorse areas.	Taylor Fork	The Taylor Fork travel planning area contains extensive areas of natural erosive Cretaceous sediments, particular in the upper end of the drainage (Cache Creek and Deadhorse Creek). Most of the most erosive roads have been decommissioned in recent years. The Taylor Fork 4B report, which has been submitted to the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Montana DEQ in 2005 contains an extensive description of sediment sources in the upper Taylor Fork drainage.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	The Bangtails not only have high existing sediment yields, but they are one of two TPAs that will have increases in sediment under the preferred alternative. Although new construction of motorized trails is not allowed in Bangtail of NF Willow Creek until 12 miles of road are decommissioned, additional roads need to be closed and obliterated to reverse the trend in this TPA. Closure of some of these roads will also add to the integrity of the SIA proposed in the Bangtail Mountains.	Bangtails	The Gallatin NF is planning to decommission about 46.6 miles of roads in the Bangtail TPA to reduce sediment. In addition about 1.2 miles user-built trails not part of the Gallatin National Forest transportation system or those not planned to be part of the trail system in the Travel Plan would be obliterated. The objectives include improve the infiltration of water into road surfaces to reduce the water channeling effect of roads, remove culverts and restore the natural channel characteristics where roads cross streams, reduce sediment transport from road surfaces directly into streams, and facilitate the growth of vegetation on road surfaces. Detailed maps of the project area available for review at the Bozeman Ranger District Office. The project is anticipitated to reduce the estimated sediment in the Bangtails from the 35.37% over natural shown in the DEIS for alternative 1 to 25.04% over natural for Alterative 1 in the FEIS. The work is focused Bangtail Creek, Willow Creek, Perkins Creek, and Jackson Creek with a goal of reducing sediment to Yellowstone Cutthroat fisheries. See the Direct and Indirect Effects section of issue 20 (Watershed Management).
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	The Bangtails contain YCT and had an objective to restore and stabilize up to 80 miles of road to minimize sediment delivery. This has been reduced to up to 30 miles in the DEIS. Road restoration and stabilization should be maximized in this TPA.	Bangtails	The Gallatin NF is planning to decommission about 46.6 miles of roads in the Bangtail TPA to reduce sediment. In addition about 1.2 miles user-built trails not part of the Gallatin National Forest transportation system or those not planned to be part of the trail system in the Travel Plan would be obliterated. The objectives include improve the infiltration of water into road surfaces to reduce the water channeling effect of roads, remove culverts and restore the natural channel characteristics where roads cross streams, reduce sediment transport from road surfaces directly into streams, and facilitate the growth of vegetation on road surfaces. Detailed maps of the project area available for review at the Bozeman Ranger District Office. The project is anticipitated to reduce the estimated sediment in the Bangtails from the 35.37% over natural shown in the DEIS for alternative 1 to 25.04% over natural for Alterative 1 in the FEIS. The work is focused Bangtail Creek, Willow Creek, Perkins Creek, and Jackson Creek

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						with a goal of reducing sediment to Yellowstone Cutthroat fisheries. Any additional ATV construction would not be completed until the road decommissioning work is completed. See the Direct and Indirect Effects section of issue 20 (Watershed Management).
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	We greatly appreciate the wisdom of presenting new route building in Bangtail and Willow Creeks until fishery objectives are met by road obliteration, but believe also that motorized route density in this range needs to be decreased for a host of reasons: fisheries, wildlife connectivity, SIA, etc. If the decommissioning of 12 miles of road in Willow and Bangtail Creeks are required to meet the 90% capability threshold, then will construction of new ATV, motorcycle and mountain bike routes raise the threshold level again? We are very concerned about additional construction in these drainages. The Bangtail TPA contains one of the highest sediment levels on the Forest, therefore, it is not appropriate for additional trail construction and increases in sediment.	Bangtails	The Gallatin NF is planning to decommission about 46.6 miles of roads in the Bangtail TPA to reduce sediment. In addition about 1.2 miles user-built trails not part of the Gallatin National Forest transportation system or those not planned to be part of the trail system in the Travel Plan would be obliterated. The objectives include improve the infiltration of water into road surfaces to reduce the water channeling effect of roads, remove culverts and restore the natural channel characteristics where roads cross streams, reduce sediment transport from road surfaces directly into streams, and facilitate the growth of vegetation on road surfaces. Detailed maps of the project area available for review at the Bozeman Ranger District Office. The project is anticipitated to reduce the estimated sediment in the Bangtails from the 35.37% over natural shown in the DEIS for alternative 1 to 25.04% over natural for Alterative 1 in the FEIS. The work is focused Bangtail Creek, Willow Creek, Perkins Creek, and Jackson Creek with a goal of reducing sediment to Yellowstone Cutthroat fisheries. See the Direct and Indirect Effects section of issue 20 (Watershed Management).
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	Due to the wet nature of the trail location and the sensitive soils, motorized use should not be allowed on the loop trail in Bear Canyon.	Bear Canyon	Bear Creek (Bear Canyon) sediment loading is naturally high due to erosive soils and stream banks but is accelerated by motorized trail use to the Forest boundary. Below the Forest boundary, the Bear Canyon trail is close to Bear Creek with several direct snowmelt and storm flow discharge points directly into Bear Creek. The Gallatin NF in cooperation with Montana DNRC and Montana DEQ will be conducting rehabilitation actions at 13 problem areas in lower Bear Canyon in 2006. The rehabilitation work is designed to reduce sediment loading to Bear Creek and includes slump stabilization, additional cross drains, trail in-sloping, turnpike and ditching, rock barricade a segment of Bear Creek which ATV's drive into, additional culverts, and elevate bridge fill on the Trail # 440 bridge across Bear Creek. Long term actions will require closing Bear Creek and Bear

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Canyon to motorized use until the entire trail system is improved to a stable condition which can withstand ATV and motorcycle use. Parts of the lower section of Bear Canyon, primarily on Montana DNRC lands in the vicinity of the 2 Bear Creek fords, can be located to east of Bear Creek to avoid 2 of the fords and the west side natural slump.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	Although most of the roading and development in Big Sky is occurring on private land, there are numerous roads in the southern portion of the TPA that should be targeted for obliteration. Gallatin Roaded includes an objective to decommission old logging roads and in the Yellowstone TPA, some project road decommissioning should accompany fire recovery to improve sediment yields.	Gallatin Roaded	The Big Sky TPA has the highest % over natural sediment of any of the travel planning areas due primarily to extensive development on private land over which the Gallatin NF does not have jurisdiction. In the SE part of the Big Sky TPA approximately 6 miles of project roads (marked in green on the maps) could be obliterated. The GNF is planning to develop a programmatic NEPA document after the Travel Plan decision to decommission many of the project (green) roads. The main change on National Forest lands in the Big Sky TPA is construction of the ATV/motorcycle connector from the Buck Ridge Trail into the Yellowmule drainages as a replacement opportunity for eliminating motorized use on the Buck Creek trail.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	We are concerned that the water quality analysis does not effectively capture the impacts of motorized trail use and drive-through ATV and motorcycle stream crossings. The Forest Service uses BMP's for road construction and use, but the State has never developed BMP's for ATVs. We are especially concerned about the impacts of drive-through stream crossings in native fish and WQLS streams. Please address the need for and possibility of ATV-type BMPs for travel planning.	Issues	Goals C (Resources), D (Fisheries), and M (Resources) contains several objectives that include management of trails and ATV impacts. See issue #7 Fisheries.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	Sixmile Creek, near Emigrant, is listed as a WQLS. The travel plan should include an objective to identify sources of travel-related sediment and include language about how this travel plan can contribute to watershed recovery in the Sixmile creek drainage.	Mill Creek	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. In the Sixmile Creek drainage road 348 and trail 606 are fairly stable with minimal additional reconstruction needs.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	The Shields TPA includes a sediment objective for fisheries in the Upper Shields. We would like the WQLS to be added to this objective, as well.	Shields	Sediment issues in the upper Shields River drainage are currently being worked on in the Shields River TMDL which will be completed in 2006. The Gallatin NF is currently actively working with Montana DEQ and consultants in completion of this plan which will address sediment issues on the roads, trails, and grazing

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						allotments in the Upper Shields.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	Red Canyon Creek, located in the Cabin Creek TPA, is listed as WQLs for sediment. The Red Cub Trail #205 is open to ATV's and motorcycles in Segment 1 (to the Cabin Creek WMA boundary). Motorcycles can continue to the junction of Cabin Creek Trail #206. AWL believes that the Cabin Creek TPA must include a water quality objective for the WQLS stream and that the Red Cub Trail should be closed to motorized use until sediment problems are identified and mitigated.	Cabin Creek	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. This trail, #205 in the Cabin Creek drainage, has facility/maintenance needs that will be addressed in future decisions.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	The Gallatin Roaded TPA includes an objective to decommission and stabilize old logging roads. We would like to see specific mention of Squaw Creek and the need to target road obliteration and watershed recovery in the WQLS stream.	Gallatin Roaded	Currently, Storm Castle Creek (formerly Squaw Creek) meets GNF sediment standards as discussed in issue 20 (Watershed Management- Water Quality). Therefore, a specific road obliteration objective was not formulated for Storm Castle Creek. However, goal D and its associated objectives will be applied to the drainage as appropriate. This includes the lower two miles of road that are immediately adjacent to the stream, and which are a sporadic source of sediment, and will likely remain so unless the road is moved away from the stream. The GNF road maintenance program control sediment delivery to the degree practible in the existing alignment.
Linda Ellison		1070		In the Mission Creek/Tie Creek area, spring time seasonal closures would seem insufficient to satisfy the objective to restore and rehabilitate non-system trails. Just as in the proposed Bear Canyon and Bangtail scenarios, use should be curtailed until the trails at issue have been brought up to a condition that accommodates those uses (horse and mountain bike) and alleviates sedimentation/water quality concerns. Other trails within those drainages should also not be opened for the summer season until the trail system is of a condition that prevents erosion and watershed damage.	Mission Creek	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. The Mission/Tie Creek area has several trail segments in need of additional maintenance and reconstruction. Completion of the travel plan is intended to provide additional emphasis on the backlog of trail maintenance needs. Some of those projects will require additional NEPA decisions.
Patti Steinmuller		1132		Bear Canyon - this area has been badly damaged by motorized use in the past and similar damage will likely recur if the area is reopened to motorized access. Motorized use is damaging to wetland resources and it would be wasteful of time, money, and effort to allow to motorized use to resume after restoration of this fragile area. Furthermore, since	Bear Canyon	Bear Creek (Bear Canyon) sediment loading is naturally high due to erosive soils and stream banks but is accelerated by motorized trail use to the Forest boundary. Below the Forest boundary, the Bear Canyon trail is close to Bear Creek with several direct snowmelt and storm flow discharge points directly into Bear Creek. The Gallatin NF in cooperation with Montana DNRC and

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				this area is close to Bozeman and popular with hikers and families, the population as a whole will be better served by restriction motorized use from this area.		Montana DEQ will be conducting rehabilitation actions at 13 problem areas in lower Bear Canyon in 2006. The rehabilitation work is designed to reduce sediment loading to Bear Creek and includes slump stabilization, additional cross drains, trail in-sloping, turnpike and ditching, rock barricade a segment of Bear Creek which ATV's drive into, additional culverts, and elevate bridge fill on the Trail # 440 bridge across Bear Creek. Long term actions will require closing Bear Creek and Bear Canyon to motorized use until the entire trail system is improved to a stable condition which can withstand ATV and motorcycle use. Parts of the lower section of Bear Canyon, primarily on Montana DNRC lands in the vicinity of the 2 Bear Creek fords, can be located to east of Bear Creek to avoid 2 of the fords and the west side natural slump.
Julie Hager		1306		You are using watershed damage as another excuse to close trails. I fail to see that trail closures are the only solution. Stream bank vegetation can be damaged on occasion, but in most cases, the bank only lacks vegetation on the exact tire tracks themselves, which is no different than a footpath. A problem that could be solved by providing proper stream crossings for the trail.	Issues	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals are facility issues that will require future and separate NEPA decisions. However, for many trails closure to motorized use is partially prompted considering the condition of the trail and maintenance needed to attain forest wide goals for trail standards. Many trails that have known watershed damage issues are not proposed to be closed but will be brought up to standards during travel plan implementation. Some of these areas will require future NEPA decisions, particularly where relocation and heavy reconstruction are required.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Jackson Creek drainage-an extensive road network, high density in places with many crossings, creates a high potential for increased sedimentation in this drainage. Trail rehabilitation and relocation would seem necessary to protect water quality while supporting motorized travel.	Bangtails	Jackson Creek currently has about 24.5 miles of road on NF lands. The Bangtails road decommissioning project would reduce road mileage to about 14.2 miles. Overall sediment levels in Jackson would be reduced from about 30% over natural to 18% over natural.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Bear Canyon: degraded trail condition in this drainage causes severe sedimentation that directly harms water quality. The trail is severely rutted by OHV travel causing excessive erosion in the highly erosive soils of this basin. Considerable trail rehabilitation and relocation would seem necessary to protect water quality while allowing motorized travel.	Bear Canyon	Bear Creek (Bear Canyon) sediment loading is naturally high due to erosive soils and stream banks but is accelerated by motorized trail use to the Forest boundary. Below the Forest boundary, the Bear Canyon trail is close to Bear Creek with several direct snowmelt and storm flow discharge points directly into Bear Creek. The Gallatin NF in cooperation with Montana DNRC and Montana DEQ will be conducting rehabilitation actions at

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						13 problem areas in lower Bear Canyon in 2006. The rehabilitation work is designed to reduce sediment loading to Bear Creek and includes slump stabilization, additional cross drains, trail in-sloping, turnpike and ditching, rock barricade a segment of Bear Creek which ATV's drive into, additional culverts, and elevate bridge fill on the Trail # 440 bridge across Bear Creek. Long term actions will require closing Bear Creek and Bear Canyon to motorized use until the entire trail system is improved to a stable condition which can withstand ATV and motorcycle use. Parts of the lower section of Bear Canyon, primarily on Montana DNRC lands in the vicinity of the 2 Bear Creek fords, can be located to east of Bear Creek to avoid 2 of the fords and the west side natural slump.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Big Bear/Little Bear Complex: the extensive road prism in this area has contributed additional sediments to the local drainage. We understand that a number of roads are been reclaimed in the area. However, road drainage could be improved in many other areas to minimize sedimentation.	Gallatin Roaded	The GNF is planning to develop a programmatic NEPA document after the Travel Plan decision to decommission many of the project (green) roads. A number of project roads in Big Bear, Little Bear, Wilson, and West Wilson Creeks are good candidates for project road decommissioning. The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. These trails in the Gallatin Roaded TPA have facility/maintenance needs that will be addressed in future decisions.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Squaw Creek: a segment of the main Squaw Creek Road closely parallels the stream, which calls for more attention to proper road maintenance and sediment control in this area.	Gallatin Roaded	The portion of Squaw (now officially Storm Castle Creek) road for about 2 miles east (upstream) of the Gallatin River confluence, as indicated in the comment, is very close to Storm Castle Creek and certainly a potential sediment source during snowmelt runoff and localized heavy rain events. The GNF road maintenance program manages sediment levels through road drainage and culvert and ditch maintenance but without road relocation the road section will likely continue to be a sporadic sediment source. Overall sediment levels in Storm Castle Creek are will within GNF sediment guidelines as discussed in Issue 20 (Watershed Management - Water Quality).
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Backcountry 4x4 Roads: in addition to hardening to prevent resource damage, provisions for providing correct slope and grade to prevent unnecessary	Issues	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				runoff and erosion are necessary. This is especially important in areas near streams and riparian areas.		separate NEPA decisions. Goals C (Resources), D (Fisheries), and M (Resources) contains several objectives that include management of trails and ATV impacts.
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	1441		Endorse year-long closure to ATVs and motorcycles on Bear Lakes Trail #532 to Bozeman Creek divide. Because Bear Creek is on the TMDL water quality list, Bear Loop Trail #440 should be close to ATVs and motorcycles and Bear Canyon from trailhead to junction with the 440 Loop near Bear Lakes. An additional reason for discontinuing ATV and motorcycle use is social conflict with the home owners at the trailhead as well as users of the New World Gulch trail.	Bear Canyon	Bear Creek (Bear Canyon) sediment loading is naturally high due to erosive soils and stream banks but is accelerated by motorized trail use to the Forest boundary. Below the Forest boundary, the Bear Canyon trail is close to Bear Creek with several direct snowmelt and storm flow discharge points directly into Bear Creek. The Gallatin NF in cooperation with Montana DNRC and Montana DEQ will be conducting rehabilitation actions at 13 problem areas in lower Bear Canyon in 2006. The rehabilitation work is designed to reduce sediment loading to Bear Creek and includes slump stabilization, additional cross drains, trail in-sloping, turnpike and ditching, rock barricade a segment of Bear Creek which ATV's drive into, additional culverts, and elevate bridge fill on the Trail # 440 bridge across Bear Creek. Long term actions will require closing Bear Creek and Bear Canyon to motorized use until the entire trail system is improved to a stable condition which can withstand ATV and motorcycle use. Parts of the lower section of Bear Canyon, primarily on Montana DNRC lands in the vicinity of the 2 Bear Creek fords, can be located to east of Bear Creek to avoid 2 of the fords and the west side natural slump.
Gary Weiner		1607		The other major erosion problem is along the farthest southern part of the loop trail, in the vicinity of Cooper reservoir, and extends for about a half-mile. This piece of trail crosses several small tributaries to Bear Creek, and its alignment is fairly steep. The tributary crossings are widened and deepened, in one case so much as to make ATV crossing difficult. Other upland parts of the trail in this are have trapped rainwater, developed deep potholes from ATV use, and riders have formed bypass trails around the holes. The tributaries could be improved with regrading and installing rolling water bars.	Bear Canyon	Bear Creek (Bear Canyon) sediment loading is naturally high due to erosive soils and stream banks but is accelerated by motorized trail use to the Forest boundary. Below the Forest boundary, the Bear Canyon trail is close to Bear Creek with several direct snowmelt and storm flow discharge points directly into Bear Creek. The Gallatin NF in cooperation with Montana DNRC and Montana DEQ will be conducting rehabilitation actions at 13 problem areas in lower Bear Canyon in 2006. The rehabilitation work is designed to reduce sediment loading to Bear Creek and includes slump stabilization, additional cross drains, trail in-sloping, turnpike and ditching, rock barricade a segment of Bear Creek which ATV's drive into, additional culverts, and elevate bridge fill on the Trail # 440 bridge across Bear Creek. Long term actions will require closing Bear Creek and Bear

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Canyon to motorized use until the entire trail system is improved to a stable condition which can withstand ATV and motorcycle use. Parts of the lower section of Bear Canyon, primarily on Montana DNRC lands in the vicinity of the 2 Bear Creek fords, can be located to east of Bear Creek to avoid 2 of the fords and the west side natural slump.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The Bangtails not only have high existing sediment yields, but they are one of two TPAs that will have increases in sediment under the preferred alternative. Although new construction of motorized trails is not allowed in Bangtail of NF willow Creek until 12 miles of road are decommissioned, additional roads need to be closed and obliterated to reverse the trend in this TPA. Closure of some of these roads will also add to the integrity of the SIA proposed in the Bangtail Mountains.	Bangtails	The Gallatin NF is planning to decommission about 46.6 miles of roads in the Bangtail TPA to reduce sediment. In addition about 1.2 miles user-built trails not part of the Gallatin National Forest transportation system or those not planned to be part of the trail system in the Travel Plan would be obliterated. The objectives include improve the infiltration of water into road surfaces to reduce the water channeling effect of roads, remove culverts and restore the natural channel characteristics where roads cross streams, reduce sediment transport from road surfaces directly into streams, and facilitate the growth of vegetation on road surfaces. Detailed maps of the project area available for review at the Bozeman Ranger District Office. The project is anticipitated to reduce the estimated sediment in the Bangtails from the 35.37% over natural shown in the DEIS for alternative 1 to 25.04% over natural for Alterative 1 in the FEIS. The work is focused Bangtail Creek, Willow Creek, Perkins Creek, and Jackson Creek with a goal of reducing sediment to Yellowstone Cutthroat fisheries. See the Direct and Indirect Effects section of issue 20 (Watershed Management).
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The Bangtails have one of the highest sediment yields above natural on the Forest and is one of two TPAs where sediment yield is expected to increase under the preferred alternative. It is critical that road restoration and stabilization is maximized in this TPA.	Bangtails	The Gallatin NF is planning to decommission about 46.6 miles of roads in the Bangtail TPA to reduce sediment. In addition about 1.2 miles user-built trails not part of the Gallatin National Forest transportation system or those not planned to be part of the trail system in the Travel Plan would be obliterated. The objectives include improve the infiltration of water into road surfaces to reduce the water channeling effect of roads, remove culverts and restore the natural channel characteristics where roads cross streams, reduce sediment transport from road surfaces directly into streams, and facilitate the growth of vegetation on road surfaces. Detailed maps of the project area available for review at the Bozeman Ranger District Office. The project is

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						anticipitated to reduce the estimated sediment in the Bangtails from the 35.37% over natural shown in the DEIS for alternative 1 to 25.04% over natural for Alterative 1 in the FEIS. The work is focused Bangtail Creek, Willow Creek, Perkins Creek, and Jackson Creek with a goal of reducing sediment to Yellowstone Cutthroat fisheries. Any additional ATV construction would not be completed until the road decommissioning work is completed. See the Direct and Indirect Effects section of issue 20 (Watershed Management).
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		If decommissioning 12 miles of road in Willow and Bangtail Creeks is required and meet the 90T habitat capability threshold, it does not make sense to construct new ATV, motorcycle and mountain bike routes which will only raise the threshold level again. Again, we oppose additional trail construction in this area.	Bangtails	The Gallatin NF is planning to decommission about 46.6 miles of roads in the Bangtail TPA to reduce sediment. In addition about 1.2 miles user-built trails not part of the Gallatin National Forest transportation system or those not planned to be part of the trail system in the Travel Plan would be obliterated. The objectives include improve the infiltration of water into road surfaces to reduce the water channeling effect of roads, remove culverts and restore the natural channel characteristics where roads cross streams, reduce sediment transport from road surfaces directly into streams, and facilitate the growth of vegetation on road surfaces. Detailed maps of the project area available for review at the Bozeman Ranger District Office. The project is anticipitated to reduce the estimated sediment in the Bangtails from the 35.37% over natural shown in the DEIS for alternative 1 to 25.04% over natural for Alterative 1 in the FEIS. The work is focused Bangtail Creek, Willow Creek, Perkins Creek, and Jackson Creek with a goal of reducing sediment to Yellowstone Cutthroat fisheries. See the Direct and Indirect Effects section of issue 20 (Watershed Management).
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Sediment in Bear Canyon is addressed by standards preventing motorized, horse, or mnt. Bike use on trails until they are restored. Due to the wet nature of the trail location and the sensitive soils, motorized use should not be allowed on the loop trail in Bear Canyon.	Bear Canyon	Bear Creek (Bear Canyon) sediment loading is naturally high due to erosive soils and stream banks but is accelerated by motorized trail use to the Forest boundary. Below the Forest boundary, the Bear Canyon trail is close to Bear Creek with several direct snowmelt and storm flow discharge points directly into Bear Creek. The Gallatin NF in cooperation with Montana DNRC and Montana DEQ will be conducting rehabilitation actions at 13 problem areas in lower Bear Canyon in 2006. The rehabilitation work is designed to reduce sediment loading to Bear Creek and includes slump stabilization,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						additional cross drains, trail in-sloping, turnpike and ditching, rock barricade a segment of Bear Creek which ATV's drive into, additional culverts, and elevate bridge fill on the Trail # 440 bridge across Bear Creek. Long term actions will require closing Bear Creek and Bear Canyon to motorized use until the entire trail system is improved to a stable condition which can withstand ATV and motorcycle use. Parts of the lower section of Bear Canyon, primarily on Montana DNRC lands in the vicinity of the 2 Bear Creek fords, can be located to east of Bear Creek to avoid 2 of the fords and the west side natural slump.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Much of the roads and development in Big Sky is occurring on private land, making it especially important for the FS to address sediment problems through the obliteration and restoration of the numerous roads in the southern portion of the TPA.	Big Sky	The Big Sky TPA has the highest % over natural sediment of any of the travel planning areas due primarily to extensive development on private land over which the Gallatin NF does not have jurisdiction. In the SE part of the Big Sky TPA approximately 6 miles of project roads (marked in green on the maps) could be obliterated. The GNF is planning to develop a programmatic NEPA document after the Travel Plan decision to decommission many of the project (green) roads. The main change on National Forest lands in the Big Sky TPA is construction of the ATV/motorcycle connector from the Buck Ridge Trail into the Yellowmule drainages as a replacement opportunity for eliminating motorized use on the Buck Creek trail. The Big Sky TPA has the highest % over natural sediment of any of the travel planning areas due primarily to extensive development on private land over which the Gallatin NF does not have jurisdiction. In the SE part of the Big Sky TPA approximately 6 miles of project roads (marked in green on the maps) could be obliterated. The GNF is planning to develop a programmatic NEPA document after the Travel Plan decision to decommission many of the project (green) roads. The main change on National Forest lands in the Big Sky TPA is construction of the ATV/motorcycle connector from the Buck Ridge Trail into the Yellowmule drainages as a replacement opportunity for eliminating motorized use on the Buck Creek trail.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The Gallatin Roaded TPA includes an objective to decommission and stabilize old logging roads. TWS encourages you to prioritize road obliteration and watershed recovery in Squaw Creek, a WQLS	Issues	The GNF is planning to develop a programmatic NEPA document after the Travel Plan decision to decommission many of the project (green) roads. A number of project roads in Big Bear, Little Bear, Wilson,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				stream. The Shields TPA includes a sediment objective for fisheries in the Upper Shields. We would like the WQLS to be added to this objective as well.		and West Wilson Creeks are good candidates for project road decommissioning. Storm Castle (formerly Squaw Creek), Moose Creek, and a few road segments in Swan Creek are also good candidates for project road obliteration.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		We urge the FS to include a water quality objective for Red Canyon Creek, located in the Cabin Creek TPA, and listed as a WQLS for sediment. The first segment of this trail #206, through the junction of Cabin Creek Trail, #206 should be closed to motorized use until sediment problems are identified and mitigated.	Issues	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. This trail #206 in the Cabin Creek drainage have facility/maintenance needs that will be addressed in future decisions.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The FS should also include an objective to identify sources of travel-related sediment and provide a plan that will recover the watershed in the Sixmile Creek drainage.	Issues	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. In the Sixmile Creek drainage road 348 and trail 606 are fairly stable with minimal additional reconstruction needs.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The FS chose not to study the effect of snowmobiles on air quality, despite the issue being identified in public comments. The agency appears to have made this decision based exclusively on the determination that air quality does not exceed National Ambient Air Quality Standards. While pollutants emitted from snowmobile exhaust may not exceed specific health standards, which does not mean that there are no ill effects to those who breathe the emissions. For individuals with asthma, pulmonary illness, comprised immune systems, pregnant women and the elderly, exposure to these pollutants can be problematic, especially for those coming from lower altitudes and are being physically active. We urge you to consider the effects of snowmobiles on air quality in the Final EIS, if only in the context of providing additional opportunities for separate non-motorized winter recreation. Winter air is often stagnant in low areas such as mountain valleys, limiting dispersion of emissions. Heavy snowmobile traffic in congested areas also contributes to emissions causing air quality concerns.	Issues	The description for issue #24 was expanded to include a more complete description of potential adverse health effects of snowmobile emissions to individuals who have less physical ability to deal with snowmobile emissions. The revised Alternative 7 in the FEIS has numerous areas, such as the Bear Canyon trailhead (snowmobiles not allowed), where heavy snowmobile traffic in congested areas would be managed to reduce air quality concerns.
				Sedimentation provides a significant negative impact when compared to the thousands of tons of	Issues	Table 3.20.10 in the Issue #20 (Watershed Management) section and the subsequent narrative

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				sedimentation typically moving with a stream during a typical spring run off.		estimate natural sediment levels for each alternative which averages 93.6%,
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Improved drainage and some road resurfacing is needed to mitigate sediment impacts from Kersey Lake Road.	Cooke City	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. The Kersey Lake Road is in need of maintenance to reduce sediment impacts to the Clarks Fork and Broadwater rivers. Completion of the travel plan will help prioritize and provide additional emphasis on the backlog of road maintenance needs. Kersey Lake Road maintenance will be conducted within the context of TP goals D and M, and their associated objectives and standards. Goal 3 and Objective 3(2) for the Cooke City TPA also address this concern.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Middle Fork Upper Deer Creek Trail #112 needs significant rerouting to reduce sediment delivery to stream and Lower Deer #5 needs stream crossing improvements.	Deer Creeks	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. Consistent with standard 3(1) for the Deer Creek TPA, the Deer Creeks and Placer Gulch trails would not be open to summer motorized use until the facilities are brought to a standard that does not degrade Yellowstone cutthroat trout habitat. During the summer of 2004 and 2005, stream crossings on the Placer Gulch trail were rehabilitated to reduce sediment and channel impacts. The project was successful and the trail currently meets standard 3(1). Substantial stream crossing reconstruction on Deer Creek trail #5 from its junction with Placer Gulch trail to the Deer Creek cabin and downstream to Red Mountain Trail #156 are being planned consistent with TP Goal E and TP Objective E1. These projects will require a separate NEPA analysis and decision. It is currently believed that certain crossing designs can be implemented to meet standard 3(1) for the Deer Creek TPA. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin (and other reasons) Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be open to motorized use from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin once the site specific standard is met. Under Alternative 7M, West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Stream crossing on Dry Fork #20 needs restoration and seasonal restrictions to reduce sediment delivery from motorized use and stock use.	East Boulder	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. The Dry Fork stream crossing in question is in need of maintenance to reduce sediment impacts to the East Boulder River. Completion of the travel plan will help prioritize and provide additional emphasis on the backlog of road and trail maintenance needs. Maintenance and/or reconstruction of the Dry Fork crossing will be conducted within the context of TP goals D and E, and their associated objectives and standards.
Todd Orr		840		5 - East Fork Deer Creek - Alt 7 closes 5 for YCT protection. Why is the lower section remaining open to ATV and motorcycles and the upper section closed? Are YCT only present above the ATV trail and not downstream? Is a half dozen passes a year by a motorcycle on the upper trail really detrimental to YCT? Suggest managing as is - open to motorcycle use unless detrimental to YCT population.	Deer Creeks	Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 from the its' junction with Trail #156 to its' junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 will be open to motorcycles to provide a motorcycle loop connection with the Red Mountain Trail #156, and because of the number of creek crossing in this area that will be cheaper and less impactive to harden for motorcycle use as opposed to ATV use. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be open to ATV's from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with a need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. Consistent with standard 3(1) for the Deer Creek TPA, the Deer Creeks and Placer Gulch trails would not be open to summer motorized use until the facilities are brought to a standard that does not degrade Yellowstone cutthroat trout habitat. Substantial stream crossing reconstruction on Deer Creek trail #5 from its junction with Placer Gulch trail to the Deer Creek cabin and downstream to Red Mountain Trail #156 are being planned, but are outside

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						the scope of this EIS and will require a separate NEPA analysis and decision. It is currently believed that certain crossing designs can be implemented to meet standard 3(1) in the main Lower Deer Creek channel north of the cabin. From the Deer Creek cabin south, the trail crosses unstable, high gradient incised tributary channels with high erosion and sediment potential. Construction of suitable crossings over these tributary channels would be problematic.
Roger Raw		963	Big Timber	The East Crazies should be left as is. Closing a wide area of use and funneling it all into one small area is going to vastly impact Cottonwood Creek.	East Crazies	To provide a variety of uses and experiences in the Crazy Mountains as a whole, alternative 7M reconfigures motorized uses by allowing motorcycles on the Shields Lowline Trail #258 from the Porcupine Cabin trailhead to the Sunlight Trailhead. Motorcycles would also be allowed on the Porcupine Lowline Trail #267 from Ibex to Porcupine Cabin. The South Fork of the Shields is being managed for stock users and hikers to provide for non-motorized opportunities and to protect cultural resources in the high alpine basins as stated as rationale in Chapter III-12. In 7M Cottonwood Lake Trail #197 will be open to ATV and motorcycles on the roadbed into Section 9. From this point on the trail will be closed to motorcycles due to tribal interests and cultural sites. In 7M the North Rock Trail #270, which provides access to a lake, the Porcupine Lowline #267 and a portion of the Shields Lowline #258 will be open to motorcycles. Rationale is stated in Chapter III-12.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	The Deer Creek TPA has impacts to YCT that can not be mitigated under the various alternatives and will maintain existing effects to YCT in Lower Deer Creek. Alternative 7 includes a standard to remove summer motorized use on the Deer Creek and Placer Gulch until YCT habitat reaches 90% habitat capability. Will this motorized use removal have a measurable restoration effect on YCT fisheries? Does it result in a "No Impact" finding? If not, perhaps the Forest Service should consider closure of the Lower Deer Creek trail and the relocation of the Deer Creek cabin. If the trail location is not sustainable, something significant must be done to prevent fisheries impacts.	Deer Creeks	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. Consistent with standard 3(1) for the Deer Creek TPA, the Deer Creeks and Placer Gulch trails would not be open to summer motorized use until the facilities are brought to a standard that does not degrade Yellowstone cutthroat trout habitat. During the summer of 2004 and 2005, stream crossings on the Placer Gulch trail were rehabilitated to reduce sediment and channel impacts. The project was successful and the trail currently meets standard 3(1). Substantial stream crossing reconstruction on Deer Creek trail #5 from its junction with Placer Gulch trail to the Deer Creek cabin and downstream to Red Mountain Trail #156 are being planned consistent with TP Goal E and TP

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Objective E1. These projects will require a separate NEPA analysis and decision. It is currently believed that certain crossing designs can be implemented to meet standard 3(1) for the Deer Creek TPA. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin (and other reasons) Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be open to motorized use from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin once the site specific standard is met.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	The overall goal, which emphasizes motorized and stock use, is not compatible with fisheries in this TPA. Numerous roads and trails need seasonal restrictions to reduce sediment delivery during the spring. We expect the finalized Travel Plan to address this. Can the summer use opening date be changed for this area to allow for spring seasonal closures?	Deer Creeks	Goal 3 for the Deer Creeks TPA emphasizes management of Yellowstone cutthroat trout habitat. Standard 3(1) for the Deer Creeks TPA restricts motorized use until facilities are brought to a standard that does not degrade YCT habitat. The primary concern relative to motorized use is the numerous trail crossings on Placer Gulch Trail #256 and Lower Deer Creek Trail #5. Consistent with standard 3(1) for the Deer Creek TPA, the Deer Creeks and Placer Gulch trails would not be open to summer motorized use until the facilities are brought to a standard that does not degrade Yellowstone cutthroat trout habitat. During the summer of 2004 and 2005, stream crossings on the Placer Gulch trail were rehabilitated to reduce sediment and channel impacts. The project was successful and the trail currently meets standard 3(1). Substantial stream crossing reconstruction on Deer Creek trail #5 from its junction with Placer Gulch trail to the Deer Creek cabin and downstream to Red Mountain Trail #156 are being planned consistent with TP Goal E, TP Objective E1 and the site specific standard 3(1). These projects will require a separate NEPA analysis and decision. It is currently believed that certain crossing designs can be implemented to meet standard 3(1) for the Deer Creek TPA. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin (and other reasons) Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be open to motorized use from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin once the site specific standard is met.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and	1438		Darroch Creek drainage: if the current backcountry road is to stay in place every effort will need to be	Gardiner Basin	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Parks			taken to prevent sediment and erosion impacts to the Creek. It currently supports Yellowstone cutthroat trout that are unhybridized.		and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. Completion of the travel plan is intended to provide additional emphasis on the backlog of trail maintenance needs. These future projects will be conducted within the context of goals D and E, and their associated objectives and standards. Road 6962 parallels Darroch Creek but is located on a bench far above the stream channel. The steep slope from the road down to the stream is well vegetated. There are no known road/sediment related concerns for Darroch Creek. If future road/sediment related concerns are identified, they will be addressed in the road maintenance.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Smith Creek and Eastfork Smith Creek both have populations of unhybridized Yellowstone cutthroat trout. The proposed roads across the streams need to have correct grade and slope as well as adequate crossings. We are also concerned with the motorcycle/ATV use in the head end of Smith Creek. Accommodations for controlling sedimentation and erosion need to be made. Adequate crossings that will minimize or completely eliminate impacts to the stream need to be provided as well. Dugout and Lodgepole Creeks also have populations of unhybridized Yellowstone cutthroat trout and proposed backcountry roads need to address the same road issues as Smith and Eastfork Smith Creek.	Shields	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Facility (e.g., roads and trails) construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. Completion of the travel plan is intended to provide additional emphasis on the backlog of trail and road maintenance needs. The effects analysis identifies sediment as a concern for the Smith and Shields watersheds. Future road and trail construction, reconstruction, maintenance and restoration projects will be conducted within the context of TP Goals D and E, TP Objective E1 and TP Standard E4. Future projects will need to meet Standard E4 prior to implementation.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Rock Creek has unhybridized Yellowstone cutthroat trout. The proposed passenger car road along the Creek will need to have sediment and erosion controls that will protect the Creek.	Tom Miner Rock	There are no new proposed roads in the Rock Creek area. The upper portion of South Rock Creek Road #993 west of the existing gate in section 22 will have seasonal closures during spring snowmelt runoff. The road crosses Rock Creek proper near the trailhead. Additional drainage may be necessary to reduce or eliminate sediment from this crossing. However, the scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. Completion of the travel plan is intended to provide additional emphasis on the backlog of maintenance needs. These future projects will be conducted within the context of goals D and E, and their associated objectives and standards.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Yellowstone cutthroat trout inhabit Lower Deer Creek. We support the proposed temporary closure on the Deer Creek and Placer Gulch Trails to motorized traffic, and recommend that it be made permanent. It is not clear, especially considering the terrain, how this trail could be reconstructed or managed in a way that would prevent sedimentation and its impacts on Yellowstone cutthroat from occurring.	Deer Creeks	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. Consistent with standard 3(1) for the Deer Creek TPA, the Deer Creeks and Placer Gulch trails would not be open to summer motorized use until the facilities are brought to a standard that does not degrade Yellowstone cutthroat trout habitat. During the summer of 2004 and 2005, stream crossings on the Placer Gulch trail were rehabilitated to reduce sediment and channel impacts. The project was successful and the trail currently meets standard 3(1). Substantial stream crossing reconstruction on Deer Creek trail #5 from its junction with Placer Gulch trail to the Deer Creek cabin and downstream to Red Mountain Trail #156 are being planned consistent with TP Goal E and TP Objective E1. These projects will require a separate NEPA analysis and decision. It is currently believed that certain crossing designs can be implemented to meet standard 3(1) for the Deer Creek TPA. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin (and other reasons) Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be open to motorized use from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin once the site specific standard is met.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Alt 7 includes a standard to remove summer motorized use on the deer Creeks and Placer Gulch Trails until YCT habitat reaches 90% habitat capability yet there are impacts to YCT that can not be mitigated under the various alts.	Deer Creeks	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. Consistent with standard 3(1) for the Deer Creek TPA, the Deer Creeks and Placer Gulch trails would not be open to summer motorized use until the facilities are brought to a standard that does not degrade Yellowstone cutthroat trout habitat. During the summer of 2004 and 2005, stream crossings on the Placer Gulch trail were rehabilitated to reduce sediment and channel impacts. The project was successful and the trail currently meets standard 3(1). Substantial stream crossing reconstruction on Deer Creek trail #5 from its junction with Placer Gulch trail to the Deer Creek cabin and downstream to Red Mountain Trail #156 are being planned consistent with TP Goal E and TP Objective E1. These projects will require a separate

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						NEPA analysis and decision. It is currently believed that certain crossing designs can be implemented to meet standard 3(1) for the Deer Creek TPA. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin (and other reasons) Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be open to motorized use from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin once the site specific standard is met.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The FS should consider closure of the Lower Deer Creek Trail and the relocation of the Deer Creek Cabin. If the trail location is not sustainable, something significant must be done to prevent fisheries impacts. The overall goal, which emphasizes motorized and stock use, is not compatible with fisheries in this TPA. In addition, summer use opening date should be changed for numerous roads and trails need seasonal restrictions to reduce sediment delivery during the spring.	Deer Creeks	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. Consistent with standard 3(1) for the Deer Creek TPA, the Deer Creeks and Placer Gulch trails would not be open to summer motorized use until the facilities are brought to a standard that does not degrade Yellowstone cutthroat trout habitat. During the summer of 2004 and 2005, stream crossings on the Placer Gulch trail were rehabilitated to reduce sediment and channel impacts. The project was successful and the trail currently meets standard 3(1). Substantial stream crossing reconstruction on Deer Creek trail #5 from its junction with Placer Gulch trail to the Deer Creek cabin and downstream to Red Mountain Trail #156 are being planned consistent with TP Goal E and TP Objective E1. These projects will require a separate NEPA analysis and decision. It is currently believed that certain crossing designs can be implemented to meet standard 3(1) for the Deer Creek TPA. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin (and other reasons) Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be open to motorized use from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin once the site specific standard is met.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Under Alt 7 several TPAs are lacking the site-specific restoration necessary to comply with a NO Impact finding for fisheries. For example, in the East Boulder TPA, the Dry Fork Trail needs a stream crossing replacement and seasonal restrictions. These recommendations are not mentioned n the Detailed Description of the Preferred Alt East Boulder TPA section which makes it unclear if this	Issues	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Facility (e.g., roads and trails) construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. Completion of the travel plan is intended to provide additional emphasis on the backlog of trail and road maintenance needs. The effects analysis identifies the Dry Fork stream crossing as a potential sediment

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				will be completed as part of the travel planning process. For the fisheries analysis to be accurate, all of these recommendations must be accomplished.		source to the east boulder river and recognizes that some sediment related impacts may be occurring. The Dry Fork enters the East Boulder River downstream of a barrier falls that isolates a known population of genetically pure YCT above the falls. As such, the potential sediment impacts from the Dry Fork do not relate to YCT. Future maintenance and restoration projects will be conducted within the context of goals D and E, and their associated objectives and standards.
John Criger		107	Lakewood, CO	Cutthroat Trout: The biggest determent is the introduction of invasive species i.e.' Rainbow Trout. The GNF DEIS in general listed roads and trails as having no impact on any of the seven TP alternatives when it came to Cutthroat trout. That is not the information present in the "Rationale."	Issues	A combination of factors have lead to declines in cutthroat trout, including both invasive species and habitat degradation. The fisheries analysis identified routes and uses that are causing, or could contribute to, habitat degradation with resulting negative impacts to cutthroat trout. This situations require TPA or route specific mitigations of a variety of kinds (closing some routes, bringing other up to standard, and so forth). These mitigations are included as part of the rationale for the preferred alternative, on a TPA by TPA basis, as appropriate.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		The Travel Plan DEIS fails to demonstrate that the models proposed for evaluating and maintaining fisheries habitat have worked in the last planning period to maintain viability of sensitive fish species. Basing habitat criteria on existing models of sedimentation for sensitive fish does not address the issue as to past effectiveness of these models. The DEIS needs to address effectiveness of these models as a mitigation measure.	Issues	The sediment delivery model, developed and validated using sediment coring data collected on the GNF, represents only one source of information used for evaluating and maintaining fisheries habitat, and by extension, protecting sensitive fish viability. Standard E-4 was developed to consider the variety of potential factors that determine viability of fish populations (fine sediment delivery, habitat fragmentation, overall habitat quality and quantity, fish metapopulation dynamics). Thus, the sediment delivery model alone is not a mitigation measure, but rather one indicator of habitat quality.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		The Travel Plan DEIS failed to identify how viable populations of sensitive fish will be maintained in existing problem areas. The agency needs to provide information on trends of viability of sensitive fish populations on the Forest, to demonstrate that past and planned management will ensure viability. This is especially true for problem areas that will continue to be maintained in degraded conditions.	Issues	We disagree that the Travel Plan DEIS failed to identify how viable populations of sensitive fish would be maintained in 'existing problem areas'. The fisheries analysis carefully considered how various proposed travel management activities, or facilities required for them, would impact sensitive fish populations on a route-by-route basis, and proposed mitigations as appropriate to reduce these impacts. For example, in the Bangtails TPA the analysis recognized that, to maintain viable Yellowstone cutthroat populations in Bangtail and NF Willow Creeks, road decommissioning and obliteration

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						would be required before proposed travel management activities could occur. See tables 3.7.3-3.7.37 in the DEIS for details by TPA.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		We have questions in regard to the road system improvements identified in these tables as follows: It is believed that the proposed road system improvements in Tables 3.7.4 to 3.7.37 provide a complete and comprehensive listing of GNF road system deficiencies? Are all illegally user created roads and trails that are contributing sediment to surface waters, adversely impacting water quality/fisheries, identified in these tables (see potential additional problem areas that may be associated with off-road motorized uses identified in comment #21 below)? Is there a continuing road inspection, evaluation and maintenance program in place that will identify future road drainage and BMP needs that may arise? Is there an inspection, evaluation and road maintenance program for closed, but unobliterated, roads? Is there adequate funding and resources to carry out needed road improvements and BMP upgrades to reduce sediment delivery from roads to surface waters?	Issues	We believe that the fisheries analysis accurately denotes potential impacts to fish and amphibian populations from the travel management proposals detailed in each alternative. The impacts of uninventoried motorized routes, including illegally created roads and trails were considered under the analysis for Alternative 1. These are presumed closed in Alternatives 2-7. The tables do not constitute a comprehensive listing of GNF road system deficiencies; rather they summarize potential impacts of the travel management alternatives by use, including where such uses are incompatible with existing facilities. In the latter instance, mitigations are proposed. Open roads are inspected on a five-year rotation; maintenance is scheduled based on the inspection and use patterns. Closed roads are routinely inspected, with higher risk facilities inspected more often than lower risk facilities. The travel management decision will allow the GNF to focus budget requests to more specifically address travel management needs, including upgrading facilities, decommissioning others, etc. This hasn't been easily done in the past, because the GNF has not fully evaluated travel management prior to this effort. Other discussions of budget allocations are speculative at best, and are outside the scope of the Travel Management Plan.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		The FEIS should more clearly disclose whether the specific road drainage and sediment delivery problems identified in Tables 3.7.4 to 3.7.37 will be adequately addressed in the preferred travel management alternative. We believe modifications to the preferred alternative should be considered to address these road systems deficiencies, and/or reasons that such road deficiencies are not addressed described. If at all possible, we also recommend that an estimated schedule for carrying out needed road improvements and/or road decommissioning to address the water quality/fisheries problems associated with road/trail conditions and motorized uses be provided. We also recommend as an element of the preferred	Issues	The travel plan decision is focused on whether a particular use is appropriate within a Travel Planning Area, and on particular routes within that area. It therefore does not generally make specific decisions about road decommissioning, maintenance, and so forth. In some circumstances, the fisheries analysis demonstrated that a particular use, or set of uses, could not occur within a TPA, or on some routes within the TPA, without negative impacts to fish and amphibian populations. In these cases, mitigations for impacts were considered in development of alternatives, and are actually included, in most cases, in all alternatives except Alternative 1. The Travel Management Plan decision will thus include mitigations, including some requiring facility improvements or road decommissioning

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				alternative reclamation of roads in areas where roads are located in landslide prone or highly erodible soils and within RHCAs to reduce adverse effects to watersheds and water quality.		prior to allowance of specific uses, but decisions about site specific facility improvements, road decommissioning, and pertinent timeframes thereto will require additional project-specific NEPA.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		It would be helpful to define "inherent habitat capability" and "reference condition" in the Glossary in Volume 1 of the DEIS, and to include explanation of how fisheries Objectives D-1, D-2, and D-3 are to be tracked or monitored to assure that the habitat is managed to maintain or progress toward the 75% or 90% of the "inherent habitat capability" or "reference condition" objectives.	Issues	Inherent habitat capability and reference condition will be defined in the Glossary using Montana Department of Environmental Quality's definition: 'the condition of a waterbody capable of supporting its present and future beneficial uses when all reasonable land, soil, and water conservation practices have been applied'.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		We encourage the GNF to follow through on modification and/or replacement of problem culverts with fish passage problems. Is there a written time schedule for implementation of the prioritized culvert placements?	Issues	Culvert replacement or modification is occurring as money can be obtained, because these projects are costly. We used the prioritized list, and a set of 'on-the-shelf' designs for the top priorities on the list, to compete for funding from a variety of internal and external sources. Using that approach, we are able to replace or modify about two culverts a year. Additional culverts are taken care of as part of larger road maintenance or Capital Investment Projects when possible.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		The DEIS notes that the preferred alternative will have unmitigateable impacts including two routes in the Deer Creek TPA (#5 and #12) that will impact Yellowstone cutthroat trout habitat, with trails crossing Lower Deer Creek in numerous locations where steep banks deliver sediment to the stream. We recommend consideration of use of vegetative plantings, silt fences, and/or rock or log placement along the stream banks and/or steep slopes to reduce sediment entry into the stream.	Issues	We are considering all of the options noted in this comment, along with others, for reducing impacts in Lower Deer Creek. We have successfully used a variety of these techniques at other locations in the past, and feel that they will be useful in reducing impacts in Lower Deer Creek.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		We support the intent of fisheries Objective D-4 and D-5 and roads and trails Standards M-1 through M-6 regarding road impacts on water quality, but suggest some additional Standards and/or Guidelines regarding design of stream crossings, road stabilization and other issues to protect water quality and fisheries as follows: Minimize road stream crossings, and road and landing locations in riparian areas; Avoid disruption of natural hydrologic flow paths and making channel changes on streams and drainages; Construct and maintain stream crossings to prevent diversion of stream flow out of the channel	Standards and Guidelines	We believe our proposed standards are sufficient to address the concerns raised: standard E-5 (formerly M-5) includes language minimizing stream crossings and placement of roads or trails within floodplains, whereas E-6 (formerly M-6) addresses hydrologic flow paths and channel changes, and organism passage which requires factor likes natural stream grade, substrate, channel alignment, and accommodation of floods.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				and down the road in the event of crossing failure; Stream crossing should simulate natural stream grade and substrate as much as possible in fish bearing streams (use bridges, arches and open bottom culverts); When constructing new, replacement and reconstructed culverts, bridges and other stream crossings accommodate a 100-7ear flood, including associated bedload and debris. Culverts should be properly aligned with the stream channel. (comment continued)		
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Undersized culverts should be replaced and culverts which are not properly aligned or which present fish passage problems and/or serve as barriers to fish migration should be adjusted. Construction of stream crossings should occur during periods of low stream flow (usually in late summer or early Fall). Special care should be taken to avoid or minimize impacts to the stream channel and to riparian vegetation during construction. Stream banks disturbed during construction should be revegetated. Operation of equipment within the channels of creeks and rivers only occurs if absolutely necessary and with proper permits and authorizations (e.g. Clean Water Act 404 permits, Montana DEQ 318 authorizations and/or Montana DFW&P 124 authorizations); Complete watershed analysis, prior to construction of new roads or landings in RCAs. The level of analysis should be commensurate with the scope and issues of the project and related aquatic resources; (comment continued)	Standards and Guidelines	Culverts, including existing facilities, and those proposed, are address under goals D and E. The FS is already required to obtain the permits described, so a standard stipulating them is redundant; however, standard E-5 stipulates that crossings through floodplains and wetlands can only occur where necessary and with 'appropriate permits'. At the time these permits are obtained, the design and timing of construction of stream crossings, including impacts to the stream channel and riparian vegetation, are coordinated with the various regulatory agencies and FS biologists and hydrologists to minimize impacts. The GNF does not currently include RCA direction because those apply to Forests with ESA listed fish; however, we did include standard E-5 which stipulates that roads or trails 'shall not be located in the floodplains of river and streams or in wetlands except where necessary to cross a stream or wetland...'; this seems to meet the intent of this comment. The NEPA for such future activities will include analysis of the impacts to aquatic resources, in part as noted in standard E-4, which incorporates watershed level considerations of fish habitats and sediment delivery.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Avoid constructing roads on unstable land types or landslide or mass failure prone areas. Such areas should be identified for avoidance prior to road design and construction. Conduct implementation and effectiveness monitoring plans for road stability, drainage, and erosion control; Stabilize road cut and fill slopes; Avoid sediment delivery to streams from the road surface.	Standards and Guidelines	As noted in other comment responses, roads are monitored with respect to the attributes described, so an additional standard to that effect is redundant. Professional engineering standards provide guidance with respect to road construction, including site selection and location, and locations such as those described by the commentor are avoided if at all possible. Finally, goals D and E, with attendant objectives, standards and guidelines are designed in part to address sediment delivery from road surfaces. In summary, given these

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						existing forms of direction, we feel no additional standards or guidelines are necessary.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	West Fork Wilson is not meeting its 90% habitat capability and objectives and standards provide for its restoration.	Gallatin River Canyon	We agree with this comment that the proposed standards do provide for restoration of WF Wilson Creek. In addition, the GNF has undertaken a number of restoration actions in the watershed, including road obliteration, to aid watershed recovery.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	Middle Fork Cabin Creek, the WCT section of this trail should be closed to motorized use to protect this rare fishery.	Hebgen Basin	This trail and its uses were carefully considered in the fisheries analysis to determine impacts to WCT. This analysis determined that the proposed uses of the trail were within the capability of the facility, did not negatively impact WCT, and therefore did not require mitigation.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	Additional road removal is needed in Wildhorse Creek. Although the creek is currently meeting thresholds, the fish population should be encouraged to expand through removal of the stream crossing on Trail 436.	Hyalite	We agree with the commentors that expansion of the Wildhorse Creek westslope cutthroat trout population is desirable. However, the existing population does not currently extend to Trail 436, because the habitat at this location, and for some distance both upstream and downstream, is not sufficient to support cutthroat trout.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	Fisheries biologists have completed a very detailed and thorough analysis. We appreciate all of the site-specific standards and guidelines for fisheries restoration throughout the Forest's TPAs. Under Alternative 7, several TPAs need to have site-specific restoration to comply with a No Impact finding for fisheries. For example, in the East Boulder TPA, the Dry Fork Trail needs a stream crossing replacement and seasonal restrictions. These recommendations are not mentioned in the Detailed Description of the Preferred Alternative East Boulder TPA section.	Issues	We appreciate the comment regarding the completeness of the fisheries analysis, standards, and guidelines. Without further information, we cannot accurately respond to the assertion that 'several' TPAs need site-specific restoration to comply with the No Impact finding. With respect to Dry Creek specifically, the Dry Fork stream crossing in question is in need of maintenance to reduce sediment impacts to the East Boulder River. Completion of the travel plan will help prioritize and provide additional emphasis on the backlog of road and trail maintenance needs. Maintenance and/or reconstruction of the Dry Fork crossing will be conducted within the context of TP goals D and E, and their associated objectives and standards. These actions may require additional NEPA prior to implementation.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	For the fisheries analysis to be accurate, all of these recommendations must be accomplished. We would like the Final decision to include information about the timeline and funding for these projects.	Issues	We believe the fisheries analysis is accurate with respect to existing conditions and potential impacts of the various travel management proposals; we assume the commentor means that, for potential negative impacts to aquatic resources to be alleviated, implementation of a selected alternative must include implementation of the mitigations noted in the fisheries analysis. Because the Travel Management Plan decision is focused on the types of use that will occur within TPAs

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						and on facilities within those TPAs, mitigations included in the decision (such as road decommissioning) will require additional site specific NEPA. Additional information regarding timeframes and funding will be discussed in detail at that time.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	The travel plan includes forest-wide goals and objectives to protect native fish. The number and detail of standards and objectives for fish should be replicated for other resources on the Gallatin National Forest. There are very few genetically-pure westslope cutthroat trout streams on the forest: Wildhorse, West Fork Wilson, Middle fork Cabin, and No name Creeks.	Issues	We agree with the commentor that number and detail of aquatics standards and objectives are appropriate to protect habitat for native fish, including the small number of westslope cutthroat trout populations remaining on the GNF. These were developed specifically for protecting aquatic habitats; the level of detail and absolute number of standards and objectives is resource-by-resource specific (e.g. other resources may be less impacted by travel management planning or maybe already protected by standards detailed in other documents such as conservation strategies, biological opinions, and forest plans).
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	Why is there an MIIH determination in the BE for aquatic sensitive species? Isn't everything except for the Deer Creeks (YCT) a No Impact determination at the site-specific level?	Issues	The MIIH determination means an action 'May Impact Individuals or Habitat' but doesn't impact populations and thus won't contribute toward a listing of FS sensitive species as threatened or endangered. We use this determination in some cases, because there remains a probability that, although the impacts of various travel management activities have been appropriately mitigated at a population level, through facility design and so forth, some individual fish or amphibians may be impacted.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	In the Taylor Fork TPA, an objective seeks to "reduce contributed sediment from the road and trail system in Cache Creek to achieve Yellowstone cutthroat trout habitat at 90% of its potential habitat capability and removal of this stream as a "Water Quality Limited Segment." (Objective 4(1). For the other WQLS streams on the Forest, this type of objective needs to be articulated and accompanied with a more specific objective such as "Decommissioned up to 25 miles of undesignated road in Cache Creek and Dead Horse Creek drainages."(Objective4(2)).	Taylor Fork	Specific objectives were included where such a specific objective could be clearly tied to meeting a desired future condition, both for WQLS streams and otherwise. In other cases, such specificity was not possible (for example, the stream may be WQLS for reasons other than for road produced sediment). In the latter case, goals D and E, and their associated objectives apply.
Loren Blanksma		1194		Cutthroat trout habitat is also a documented concern. The vast majority of the stream crossings on trails in the GNF are rock-based and thus the result is very little sediment disturbance. The remaining stream	Issues	The fisheries analysis considered stream crossings on a case-by-case basis, and in many cases, these crossings were deemed to result in minimal disturbance, as the commentor suggests. In the remaining cases,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				crossings could be easily renovated by donated labor by placing a rock base in the streambed, thus eliminating sediment disturbance.		mitigations could include putting rock base in the streambed, depending upon the specific issues at a particular crossing. These site-specific mitigations will be evaluated in future NEPA analyses, because those site specific activities are generally outside the scope of the Travel Management Plan decision.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		North Fork Willow Creek and Fairy Creek both have populations of unhybridized Yellowstone cutthroat trout. The proposed roads across the streams need to have correct grade and slope as well as adequate crossings. Bangtail Creek has unhybridized Yellowstone cutthroat trout and Bridgeman as potentially unhybridized Yellowstone cutthroat trout. The proposed motorcycle and ATV use could have negative impacts without adequate mitigation. If the proposed trails are adopted sediment and erosion control as well as adequate crossings need to be provided.	Bangtails	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. The NF Willow, Bangtail, Bridgeman and Fairy Creeks area has several trail segments in need of additional maintenance and reconstruction. Completion of the travel plan is intended to provide additional emphasis on the backlog of trail maintenance needs. Some of those projects will require additional NEPA decisions.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Brackett Creek also has unhybridized Yellowstone cutthroat trout. The proposed motorcycle and ATV use could have negative impacts without proper mitigation. If the proposed trails are adopted sediment and erosion control as well as adequate crossing need to be provided.	Fairy Lake	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. Completion of the travel plan is intended to provide additional emphasis on the backlog of trail maintenance needs. These future projects will be conducted within the context of goals D and E, and their associated objectives and standards.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		The Middle Fork Brackett Creek has unhybridized Yellowstone cutthroat trout. The proposed passenger car road needs to have adequate sediment and erosion controls and crossings.	Fairy Lake	The scope of the travel plan is limited to use of roads and trails. Construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning proposals will require future and separate NEPA decisions. Completion of the travel plan is intended to provide additional emphasis on the backlog of trail maintenance needs. These future projects will be conducted within the context of goals D and E, and their associated objectives and standards.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		West Fork Wilson Creek-the stream supports an important westslope cutthroat trout population. Recent fire coupled with unstable roads in the basin has contributed additional sediment to the stream Re-contouring or rehabilitating these roads is necessary to minimize long-term harmful effects of the road system. These issues should be addressed in implementing the preferred travel plan alternative.	Gallatin Roaded	We agree with this comment, and these actions have already been implemented in the WF Wilson Creek watershed. Six miles of road have been obliterated in the watershed (accomplished in 2003)

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Swan Creek and South Fork Swan Creek: the trail closely parallels the stream throughout the length of the valley bottom, and is practically "in stream" in places. The trail may require upgrading if motorcycles are to be allowed on the trail. Roads have a similar impact on the South Fork Swan Creek. Westslope cutthroat trout may be present in the drainage and the stream could provide opportunities for restoration of westslope cutthroat trout.	Gallatin Roaded	Site-specific stream crossing construction and maintenance will be evaluated in future NEPA after the Travel Management Plan decision determines which uses are appropriate for a TPA or route. The fisheries analysis accounted for facility issues that would need mitigation to allow particular uses on routes without negatively impacting water bodies and their biota, including potential uses and routes in the Swan Creek drainage.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		South Fork Madison: headwaters of this drainage support westslope cutthroat trout. A valley-bottom road adjacent to the fish-occupied stream reach captured the stream in the past. Although stream function and the roadway have since apparently been restored, the remaining road should be assessed to identify whether or not potential threats to the stream fishery remain.	Hebgen Basin	Site specific restoration actions are generally outside the scope of the Travel Management Plan decision. However, GNF fisheries staff have evaluated both the success of restoration and the remaining road with respect to threats. The restoration actions have been successful, and will continue to be monitored. Any additional actions deemed necessary to further restoration or remedy other threats will be evaluated under NEPA separate from the Travel Management Plan.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Watkins Creek: the motorized trail as multiple stream crossings. Our concern is that all stream crossings are built and maintained to standards appropriate for the proposed uses.	Hebgen Basin	Site-specific stream crossing construction and maintenance will be evaluated in future NEPA after the Travel Management Plan decision determines which uses are appropriate for a TPA or route. The fisheries analysis accounted for facility issues that would need mitigation to allow particular uses on routes without negatively impacting water bodies and their biota, including potential uses and routes in the Watkins Creek drainage (Table 3.7.23 in DEIS).
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		No Name (Wally McClure) Creek: this stream supports a remnant population of westslope cutthroat trout. Road rehabilitation and improper maintenance is especially critical to protect the fishery in this drainage.	Hebgen Basin	The proposed direction for road 2544 is for it to become a project road, in part to protect the WCT population. The Lionhead TPA direction also contains a goal to provide habitat for this population. Any site specific ground disturbing activities, including road decommissioning or similar activities will require separate NEPA analysis, because such activities are outside the scope of the Travel Management Plan decision. GNF fisheries and hydrology staff have evaluated this road and have determined that the road is revegetating currently, is at low risk of failure, and therefore poses a low risk to the WCT population.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and	1438		Trapper Creek: the main road follows the stream within the valley bottom, causing additional	Hebgen Basin	Site-specific stream crossing construction and maintenance will be evaluated in future NEPA after the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Parks			sedimentation. Additional sediment control may be necessary.		Travel Management Plan decision determines which uses are appropriate for a TPA or route. The fisheries analysis accounted for facility issues that would need mitigation to allow particular uses on routes without negatively impacting water bodies and their biota, including potential uses and routes in the Trapper Creek drainage (Table 3.7.23 in DEIS).
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Hyalite Drainage: Lick Creek and Wildhorse Creek each support remnant populations of westslope cutthroat trout. The extensive road network in these areas has exacerbated sedimentation in places. Some culverts have created fish passage barriers. These issues should be addressed in implementing the preferred travel plan alternative.	Hyalite	The road networks in Lick and Wildhorse Creeks were taken into consideration in the fisheries analysis and effects determinations thereof; as noted in the analysis, culvert barriers are prioritized for removal or modification where appropriate (some culverts, including on Wildhorse Creek, are necessary to protect genetic purity of the westslope cutthroat). Beyond routine maintenance, site specific implementation of the Travel Management Plan decision will require further NEPA, because this decision focuses on the uses allow within a TPA, and on specific routes within the TPA.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Alternative Forest Wide Goals, Objectives, Standards and Guidelines: All stream's need to be afforded protection in terms of stream to function, sediment, fish passage, riparian conditions, road and trail crossings, and road and trail maintenance along stream and riparian corridors. The absence of species of concern does not justify allowing degradation or damage to a string. All strains server purpose in completing hydrologic cycles and providing equilibrium in the watershed. They are generally interconnected systems that eventually reach major waterways such as the Shields or Yellowstone via surface or subsurface groups. As a result they should all be treated with Best Management Practices.	Issues	We agree with the commmentors that all streams need to be afforded protection with regard to the functions described and we believe that our standards do so. Therefore, we appreciate the letter FWP provided (March 15, 2006) which provides their concurrence that our proposed standard does indeed provide appropriate protection of streams and stream functions.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Cache Creek has potentially unhybridized Yellowstone cutthroat trout and proposed roads need to have a version and runoff controls as well as adequate crossings.	Taylor Fork	The actual ground-disturbing activities associated with construction of new roads or trails will be analyzed under separate NEPA; those activities are not considered within this decision, which focuses on determining which uses are appropriate for a given TPA or route within a TPA. A proposed guideline (A-12) that will be included within this decision states that new routes for cars, 4x4s,and ATVs will remain closed until the facilities meet applicable engineering design standards; goals D and E and their associated objectives and standards will also

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						apply, and these provide a high level of protection for cutthroat trout.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Cache Creek: supports a westslope cutthroat population, like much of the upper Taylor Fork drainage area. Continued road restoration work in this area is especially important to reduce harmful hydrologic impacts and sedimentation associated with several road crossings.	Taylor Fork	We agree with this comment; this work has already been done under NEPA analyses pre-dating the Travel Management Plan. About 11 miles of road have been decommissioned, including the removal of culverts, cross-draining, and other appropriate treatments.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Left Fork, section 33: an extensive road network is packed into a small area. Culvert removal and extensive road removal or rehabilitation is recommended.	Taylor Fork	Some of this work (including culvert removal) will be completed in FY2006 under NEPA analyses pre-dating the Travel Management Plan. However, part of the road system will remain open unless FWP determines that road access to its quarter of section 33 is no longer necessary.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Buck Creek: supports westslope cutthroat trout. Current restoration/road retirement efforts in this drainage area are very positive but we support for their road rehabilitation to minimize sedimentation. At least one problematic bridge crossing (section 15, Township 8 South, Range 3 East) should be considered for removal.	Taylor Fork	The work suggested by this comment has already been completed, based on NEPA analyses pre-dating the Travel Management Plan. About 11 miles of road were decommissioned and the bridge was removed.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Wapiti Creek: the road is in close proximity to the stream, and will require upgrades and continued maintenance to avoid further sedimentation.	Taylor Fork	The Travel Management Plan decision is focused on the type of use a allowed on a facility, not on its maintenance and upgrades, so this comment is really outside the scope of this decision. However, this road is inspected at least on a five-year rotation, and is maintained based both on that inspection cycle and on its pattern of use. Furthermore, goals D and E, and associated objectives, seek to meet the intent of this comment.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		All trails, including those that are remaining unchanged and the new one that is proposed, that crosses or parallel streams and riparian areas need to provide for sediment and erosion control. Adequate crossings need to be provided as well.	Tom Miner Rock	It is unclear from the comment if the commentor feels that existing crossings are inadequate. The fisheries analysis of the various alternatives indicates that the various proposals are adequate. Any new construction or reconstruction that may occur after the Travel Management Plan decision will require site specific NEPA analysis, at which time specific trail locations, crossings, and so forth will be analyzed. Goals D and E, with associated objectives and standards, will apply at that time, and will address the concerns of the commentor.
Betsy Buffington and Janice	The Wilderness	1617		Middle Fork Cabin Creek, the WCT section of this trail should be closed to motorized use to protect this	Cabin Creek	This trail and its uses were carefully considered in the fisheries analysis to determine impacts to WCT. This

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Thomson	Society			rare fishery.		analysis determined that the proposed uses of the trail were within the capability of the facility, did not negatively impact WCT populations, and therefore did not require additional mitigation.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		West Fork Wilson is not meeting its 90% habitat capability and objectives and standards provide for its restoration.	Gallatin Roaded	We agree with this comment that the proposed standards do provide for restoration of WF Wilson Creek. In addition, the GNF has undertaken a number of restoration actions in the watershed, including 6 miles of road obliteration, to aid watershed recovery.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		For No Name Creek, there EIS still no direction for road 2544. Nor is there any objective for this 100% pure WCT fishery. The Travel Plan must protect this important drainage.	Hebgen Basin	The proposed direction for road 2544 is for it to become a project road, in part to protect the WCT population. The Lionhead TPA direction also contains a goal to provide habitat for this population. Any site specific ground disturbing activities, including road decommissioning or similar activities will require separate NEPA analysis, because such activities are outside the scope of the Travel Management Plan decision. GNF fisheries and hydrology staff have evaluated this road and have determined that the road is revegetating currently, is at low risk of failure, and therefore poses a low risk to the WCT population.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Additional road removal is needed in Wildhorse Creek. Although the creek is currently meeting thresholds, the fish population should be encourages to expand through removal of the stream crossing on Trail 436.	Hyalite	We agree with the commentors that expansion of the Wildhorse Creek westslope cutthroat trout population is desirable. However, the existing population does not currently extend to Trail 436, because the habitat at this location, and for some distance both upstream and downstream, is not sufficient to support cutthroat trout.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The FS water quality analysis does not effectively capture the impacts of motorized trail use or ATV and motorcycle stream crossings. There are BMPs for road construction and use, but none for ATVs. We are especially concerned about the impacts of drive-through stream crossings in native fish and WQLS streams. We urge you to recognize the need for such policy and adopt ATV-type BMPs for travel planning.	Issues	It is unclear from the comment why the commentors felt the analysis was insufficient to capture the impacts of motorized trail use and stream crossings. As noted in the fisheries analysis, the type of use alone may not be an accurate indication of the impacts to water quality or aquatic biota. Rather, the type of use must be considered along with the location, size and condition of the facility to determine impacts. The fisheries analyses did take these factors into account in arriving at the impact determinations for each TPA and the routes within the TPA. In doing so, some drive-through crossings were deemed to not have significant impacts (like on trail 205, Cabin Creek TPA, where the crossing is reasonably stable and dry by the time motorized traffic is allowed) whereas others were deemed to have impacts (like the Lower Deer Creek trail). With regard to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						BMPs, the Travel Management Plan decision does adopt a guideline (A-12) stating that newly designated routes may remain closed until the facilities meet applicable engineering design standards. Because the Travel Management Plan decision is focused on which kinds of uses are allowed within a TPA, further NEPA and decisions will be required for the actions which bring facilities to, or construct them at, applicable engineering design standards. Such standards already exist for ATV trail construction.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Nearly all snowmobiles used on the GNF are powered by two-stroke engines. In addition to the airborne toxins they emit, two-strokes also discharge 25-30% of their fuel mixture, unburned directly into the environment. While these toxins may not reach levels that threaten human health any time soon the impact on fish larvae and other aquatic species could be problematic and should be analyzed as the issue is not addressed in the DEIS.	Issues	As noted in the Air Quality Analysis (Issue 24), impacts to air quality were determined to be a non-significant issue overall. As the analysis further explains, air quality is expected to meet all federal and state air quality guidance for all alternatives.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		The impact of a road cut, a pioneered trail, or other disturbance, can extend well downslope of the disturbed area, and adversely affect plant communities, biodiversity and water quality. Are any measures proposed to protect fragile alpine vegetation from off-trail snowmobile use?	Snowmobiles	Seasonal snowmobile closures address this concern (Pages II-5 and 6). A listed reason for early and late season closures is “erosion control”, which would include the protection of vegetation. Seasonal closures are used in some places to prevent damaging use. Permanent snowmobile closures are proposed in large areas, such as the Crazy Mountains, the Gallatin Crest, and the Lionshead area. These areas include high mountain lands with alpine vegetation. Though the reasons are primarily wildlife-related, the closures also protect the vegetation from snowmobile disturbance. Some alpine areas are open for snowmobile use season-long (e.g. the South Plateau, Cooke City, and around West Yellowstone). There could be early and late season damage in these areas, but we are relying on the normally-deep snowpack to provide protection. The use of horses and ATV’s off-road and off-trail generally produce much more vegetation damage during the summer and fall months. The proposed limitations and reductions in these uses will do much to protect alpine vegetation.
Carl W. Philippi		310		Off road vehicles are notorious for starting fires, as are the riders who use them.	Issues	As mentioned in Chapter 2 under “Other Issues: Issue 28. Fire” (FEIS, p. 2-11), there have only been four fires caused by vehicles since 1980 according to the Forest’s

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						fire occurrence records. In addition to the Forest's restriction for operating motorized vehicles off designated trails and road systems (Forest Order 01-11-00-01, 2001), motorized vehicle use becomes more prohibited during times of high fire danger through the implementation of the Forest's fire use restrictions and forest closure process. Unwanted fire starts from the improper use of motorized off-road vehicles off designated trails and roads are rare, and therefore not considered a significant issue for travel management planning.
Timothy L. Ravndal	Montana Multiple Use Association, Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1032		Single maps were released for each alt which do not have adequate detail to disclose the roads and trails under consideration. Additionally, most motorized recreationists do not have access to 34 inch by 44 inch plotters to print the maps. This lack of disclosure and user friendly format is not reasonable or fair to the public. The color schemes for the travel plan alternative mapping are inconsistent and confusing. Green is used to demonstrate closed roads and trails when normally red is used. Again, this presentation confuses the public.	Maps	A significant amount of effort was put into developing the minimum number of maps that would display the maximum amount of information in order to minimize costs. We feel that a reasonable compromise was reached. The travel plan maps were not meant to be a stand-alone disclosure of the alternatives but were intended to be used in conjunction with the route tables for each travel planning area in the detailed description of alternatives. It was cost prohibitive to make these maps available to everyone, so copies were placed at all the ranger district and forest supervisors offices and local libraries. It was not expected that many of the public would want to print their own copies but the maps were made available in .rtl format so that those who wanted to could. There is more information than can be displayed with only red and green colors.
Brad Grein	Citizens For Balanced Use	1302		A better forest map with depictions of specific "types of use" trails would assist people unfamiliar with them.	Maps	A significant amount of effort was put into developing the minimum number of maps that would display the maximum amount of information in order to minimize costs. We feel that a reasonable compromise was reached. The travel plan maps were not meant to be a stand-alone disclosure of the alternatives but were intended to be used in conjunction with the route tables for each travel planning area in the detailed description of alternatives.
Will Robertson		304		the trail usage tables note that trails 33 and 223 (albino Lake area in Taylor fork) are open to mountain bikes, but the nonmotorized map shows them closed bikes.	Maps	This is an error and the map for alternative 7 will be corrected for the final EIS.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		It is important that the following information be presented in the interest of NEPA disclosure, assurance that the Forest Plan standard is being	Maps	The methodology for evaluating impacts to wildlife are described as a subsection within each issue discussion of Chapter 3 of the FEIS. The proposed travel

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				followed and to add credibility to the statements and conclusions made about wildlife and habitat in the FEIS: A map which shows where and how dense the cover is within each of the analysis areas, how the cover information was obtained, and what is the accuracy/confidence interval of the cover information and how current is the data. The map should also show the roads and display the miles used in the calculations in each of the analysis areas.		management plan does not involve timber harvest, prescribed fire or other actions that would remove vegetative cover. Therefore this was not considered to be of issue.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Trail #57, Buffalo Horn Lakes, is not labeled with its trail number on the DEIS maps and is not included in the tables for this travel area. Like neighboring trails #95 and 100, it should be closed to motorcycles.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Trail #57 will be labeled on the maps with the Final EIS. It is shown as closed to motorized uses in Alternatives 3 through 7-M.
Dean and Madelein Bladow		1191	Cooke City	We oppose the closure of the Sheep Mountain Road #3224, the Scotch Bonnet Road, and the Goose Lake Road #3230 Seg 1 beginning September 5 each year. We recognize and support the need to reduce disturbance to grizzly bears during the white pine nut season. There are several reasons, however, to re-evaluate the closure date: 1) White Pine crops are not abundant enough to be attractive to grizzly bears every year, 2)When mine reclamation is concluded, the reduction in road activity in the upper Fisher Creek drainage will drop to a small fraction of its current use. The fact that grizzly bears currently use the area even with current vehicle disturbance is evidence that grizzlies are not adversely effected by the disturbance; and 3) The grizzly bear is being proposed for delisting by the US Fish Wildlife Service. Rather, we recommended the Forest Service close these three roads on September 5 only during the years of abundant white pine crops and keep it open other years until December 2.	Cooke City	This proposal has been dropped from consideration. It has been replaced by an emergency closure option, which would be annually available as a management tool. It would be employed only if circumstances are present that demonstrate unique risks to bears and people. There is strong imperial evidence that the whitebark pine forest around Sheep Mountain is an important foraging area for bears. Although bears persist in using this area to feed on whitebark pine nuts in spite of the current level of human use, we can not be sure that displacement of bears does not occur under existing conditions. That is, it is possible that bears would be present at higher densities in this area and that it would play a more important role in maintaining the grizzly population if human use was less. This is reasonable speculation that can not be quantified. The seasonal closure was proposed, in part, because of the relatively high number of bear/human encounters and incidents that have occurred in the area. Although bears and humans have coexisted in this whitebark pine forest, proportionally more confrontations have taken place in this area and the potential for additional events is high. The risk for encounters many be higher during years when the cone crop is bountiful because of a higher density of bears. However, the reverse may be true: the potential for conflicts may be greater when the crop is reduced because the bears would be experiencing more stress and intraspecific competition in obtaining food and

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						be more willing to take risks to obtain sustenance before denning.
George Petry		18	Cooke City	I do not agree with your plan to close the Goose Lake jeep trail or 4 wheelers. I spend a lot of time using the trail with a 4 wheeler to access the AB. For hunting and recreation. I have seen grizzlies, and a lot of grizzly tracks, different bears. I don't believe there is a shortage of grizzlies in this area at all.	Cooke City	This proposal has been dropped from consideration. It has been replaced by an emergency closure option, which would be annually available as a management tool. It would be employed only if circumstances are present that demonstrate unique risks to bears and people. There is strong evidence that the whitebark pine forest around Sheep Mountain is an important foraging area for bears. Although bears have persisted in using this area to feed on whitebark pine nuts in spite of the current level of human use, we can not be sure that displacement of bears does not occur under existing conditions. It is possible that bears would be present at higher densities in this area and that it would play a more important role in maintaining the grizzly population if human use was less. This is reasonable speculation but it can not be quantified. The seasonal closure was proposed, in part, because of the relatively high number of bear/human encounters and incidents that have occurred in the area. Although bears and humans have coexisted in this whitebark pine forest, proportionally more confrontations have taken place in this area and the potential for additional events is high. The risk for encounters many be higher during years when the cone crop is bountiful because of a higher density of bears. However, the reverse may be true: the potential for conflicts may be greater when the crop is reduced because the bears would be experiencing more stress and intraspecific competition in obtaining food and be more willing to take risks to obtain sustenance before denning.
Jim Barrett		881		Sheep Basin and Woody Creek should be managed for grizzly bear viability and should be non-motorized.	Cooke City	Route #576 into Sheep Creek Basin is open for motorized use only for administrative purposes, an unlikely occurrence. The route is, and will remain, gated. Snowmobiling will be allowed. The route in to the Woody Creek area will be open to summer motorized access as far as the Mohawk Mine but not along the trail to the falls and the wilderness boundary. Snowmobile access will be allowed to the wilderness boundary on Woody Creek.
Bob Ebinger/ Robin Hoggan Ebinger		906	Livingston	Sheep Basin and Woody Creek should be managed for grizzly bear viability and should be non-motorized.	Cooke City	Route #576 into Sheep Creek Basin is open for motorized use only for administrative purposes, an unlikely occurrence. The route is, and will remain, gated.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Snowmobiling will be allowed. The route in to the Woody Creek area will be open to summer motorized access as far as the Mohawk Mine but not along the trail to the falls and the wilderness boundary. Snowmobile access will be allowed to the wilderness boundary on Woody Creek.
Jason and Suzanne Hahn		54		I would argue based upon my interpretation for the numbers in this section, that Alt 7 is substantially beneficial to grizzly bear habitat and it is likely that the construction of the new ATV trails will not adversely affect the secure habitat numbers and no mitigation would be necessary as the other secure habitat in this subunit offset the small impacts of the new ATV trail construction. Lake Abundance Road and Goose Lake Road need not be truncated as mitigation for the loop construction based upon the numbers given in the DEIS.	Cooke City	This proposal has been dropped from consideration. It has been replaced by an emergency closure option, which would be annually available as a management tool. It would be employed only if circumstances are present that demonstrate unique risks to bears and people. There is strong evidence that the whitebark pine forest around Sheep Mountain is an important foraging area for bears. Although bears have persisted in using this area to feed on whitebark pine nuts in spite of the current level of human use, we can not be sure that displacement of bears does not occur under existing conditions. It is possible that bears would be present at higher densities in this area and that it would play a more important role in maintaining the grizzly population if human use was less. This is reasonable speculation but it can not be quantified. The seasonal closure was proposed, in part, because of the relatively high number of bear/human encounters and incidents that have occurred in the area. Although bears and humans have coexisted in this whitebark pine forest, proportionally more confrontations have taken place in this area and the potential for additional events is high. The risk for encounters many be higher during years when the cone crop is bountiful because of a higher density of bears. However, the reverse may be true: the potential for conflicts may be greater when the crop is reduced because the bears would be experiencing more stress and intraspecific competition in obtaining food and be more willing to take risks to obtain sustenance before denning.
Jason and Suzanne Hahn		54		In Alternative 7 there is a proposal to create ATV loop trails and place seasonal restrictions on the new trails and the existing ATV trails. I am in favor of the creation of loops and connectors, but not at the compromise of the Abundance Lake Road and Goose Lake Road being truncated as is shown in Alt 7. I believe that both could be accomplished while still complying with Standard F-1 Grizzly Bear	Cooke City	The proposal to create new ATV loops and to close an equivalent amount of road as mitigation along the Goose Lake or Lake Abundance routes has been dropped. Amendment 19 to the Forest plan requires no increase in open or total motorized access route density from current levels and no decrease in core (secure) area from the current level. This proposal reflected an application of these standards and was arrived at

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Recovery. A further review of roads in the CCTPA that have been abandoned or obliterated should produce enough miles to mitigate the construction of the new loops and connectors. It could be rationalized that the roads being closed to the public and used for administrative purpose (green on the map) could be considered closed as far as grizzly bear recovery, if the administrative use would not occur during September and October (times when the habitat in the CCTPA is utilized by the grizzly bear). This would mean that mine reclamation contracts would have to be occurring only in the months of July and August. yes, this will mean longer construction seasons and higher contract costs for the GNF, but it will be a big benefit for Cooke City in the long run.		through an application of the associated empirical model. The road configuration used to complete this analysis for the subunit containing the Cooke City Basin did reflect closures accomplished through the New World Mine reclamation. Otherwise, the New World Mine reclamation work is being conducted through earlier and separate agreements from the Travel Plan. The Gallatin Forest is not at liberty to adjust the schedule and contracts for the reclamation work in the context of the Travel Plan.
Jason and Suzanne Hahn		54		The trails in the Sheep Mountain and Scotch Bonnett area are proposed to be closed from Sep 5 - July 15. I am proposing that these trails adopt the same closure of Dec 2 - Jul 1 as the other trails. I believe the information on food storage and safe recreation use is paramount to closing trails to limit chances of human and grizzly encounters. It is far more likely that there will be a grizzly mortality from a bear getting into a cooler in the back of a pick-up parked at a motel, bar or campground than the chance that a bear and human will have conflicts on the ATV trail. In addition, the closures are based on the assumption that there will be white-bark pine nuts available for the bears every year. This may not be the case and the bears may not even frequent the area except on a quick search to check the year's crop.	Cooke City	The proposal to close these routes in the fall has been dropped from consideration. Regarding bear/human conflict concerns, the issue is not a physical contact between bears and ATVs resulting in a bear mortality. Conflicts leading to mortalities may occur because of dispersed vehicle camping along the jeep road and the associated attractants that accompany that activity. Conflicts of this nature are more likely to occur in years when the cone crop is poor and bears are willing to take greater risks in approaching people to obtain food.
Earl McNinch		293		Sheep Mountain Road: this road should remain open. The compromise on this issue could be closure in the fall only when there is a large mature cone set on the white bark pines and or signage where the road goes through forest prohibiting trespass in the forest when there is a large cone set or grizzlies have been sighted .	Cooke City	This proposal has been dropped from consideration. It has been replaced by an emergency closure option, which would be annually available as a management tool. It would be employed only if circumstances are present that demonstrate unique risks to bears and people. There is strong evidence that the whitebark pine forest around Sheep Mountain is an important foraging area for bears. Although bears have persisted in using this area to feed on whitebark pine nuts in spite of the current level of human use, we can not be sure that

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						displacement of bears does not occur under existing conditions. It is possible that bears would be present at higher densities in this area and that it would play a more important role in maintaining the grizzly population if human use was less. This is reasonable speculation but it can not be quantified. The seasonal closure was proposed, in part, because of the relatively high number of bear/human encounters and incidents that have occurred in the area. Although bears and humans have coexisted in this whitebark pine forest, proportionally more confrontations have taken place in this area and the potential for additional events is high. The risk for encounters many be higher during years when the cone crop is bountiful because of a higher density of bears. However, the reverse may be true: the potential for conflicts may be greater when the crop is reduced because the bears would be experiencing more stress and intraspecific competition in obtaining food and be more willing to take risks to obtain sustenance before denning.
Nellie Isreal	Beartooth Alliance	669		We oppose the closure of the Sheep Mountain Road #3224, the Scotch Bonnett Road #3229, and the Goose Lake Road #3230, Seg.1 beginning September 5 each year. We recognize and support the need to reduce disturbance to grizzly bears during the white pine nut season. There are several reasons, however, to reevaluate the closure date: 1) White pine crops are not abundant enough to be attractive to grizzly bears every year; 2) when mine reclamation is concluded, the reduction in road activity in the upper Fisher Creek drainage will drop to a small fraction of its current use. We recommend the FS close the three roads on September 5, only during the years of abundant white pine crops and keep it open other years until December 2.	Cooke City	This proposal has been dropped from consideration. It has been replaced by an emergency closure option, which would be annually available as a management tool. It would be employed only if circumstances are present that demonstrate unique risks to bears and people. There is strong evidence that the whitebark pine forest around Sheep Mountain is an important foraging area for bears. Although bears have persisted in using this area to feed on whitebark pine nuts in spite of the current level of human use, we can not be sure that displacement of bears does not occur under existing conditions. It is possible that bears would be present at higher densities in this area and that it would play a more important role in maintaining the grizzly population if human use was less. This is reasonable speculation but it can not be quantified. The seasonal closure was proposed, in part, because of the relatively high number of bear/human encounters and incidents that have occurred in the area. Although bears and humans have coexisted in this whitebark pine forest, proportionally more confrontations have taken place in this area and the potential for additional events is high. The risk for encounters many be higher during years when the cone

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						crop is bountiful because of a higher density of bears. However, the reverse may be true: the potential for conflicts may be greater when the crop is reduced because the bears would be experiencing more stress and intraspecific competition in obtaining food and be more willing to take risks to obtain sustenance before denning.
John and Carole Oldemeyer		839		We oppose the closure of the Sheep Mountain Road 3224, the Scotch Bonnett Road 3229, and the Goose Lake Road 3230 Seg.1 beginning Sept. 5 of each year. White pine crops are not abundant enough to be attractive to grizzly bears every year and when mine reclamation is concluded, the reduction in road activity in the upper fisher Creek drainage will drop to a small fraction of its current use. We recommend the FS close the three roads on Sept. 5 only during the years of abundant whitepine crops and keep it open other years until Dec. 2.	Cooke City	This proposal has been dropped from consideration. It has been replaced by an emergency closure option, which would be annually available as a management tool. It would be employed only if circumstances are present that demonstrate unique risks to bears and people. There is strong evidence that the whitebark pine forest around Sheep Mountain is an important foraging area for bears. Although bears have persisted in using this area to feed on whitebark pine nuts in spite of the current level of human use, we can not be sure that displacement of bears does not occur under existing conditions. It is possible that bears would be present at higher densities in this area and that it would play a more important role in maintaining the grizzly population if human use was less. This is reasonable speculation that can not be quantified. The seasonal closure was proposed, in part, because of the relatively high number of bear/human encounters and incidents that have occurred in the area. Although bears and humans have coexisted in this whitebark pine forest, proportionally more confrontations have taken place in this area and the potential for additional events is high. The risk for encounters many be higher during years when the cone crop is bountiful because of a higher density of bears. However, the reverse may be true: the potential for conflicts may be greater when the crop is reduced because the bears would be experiencing more stress and intraspecific competition in obtaining food and be more willing to take risks to obtain sustenance before denning.
John and Carole Oldemeyer		839		We strongly oppose the closure/decommissioning of Goose Lake Road 3230 Seg. 2. This road is important access to fishing lakes, wilderness trailheads, and backcountry scenery. We recommend seasonal use be the same as Seg. 1.	Cooke City	The Goose Lake Road will not be closed.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jason and Suzanne Hahn		54		Ultimately, the analysis in Issue 10 is based on large subunits of which there are significant areas that are outside of the GNF. It is a stretch, at best, to parcel out the relatively small sections of the GNF and the nearby highways occurring in the subunits and still try and use the CEM, OMARD, and TMARD to make legitimate conclusions of habitat in the GNF. This section is a case of someone trying to shoehorn a high dollar research project that is not very applicable to what is needed in this DEIS. This section should be rewritten so that it is applicable to the GNF and written in a manner that is more easily understood. This section is important in establishing the goals, objectives, standards, and guidelines for the Cooke City Travel Plan Area (CCTPA) and its relevance is questionable in the current format.	Grizzly Bears	The Gallatin Forest is required to use legally recognized analysis processes and standards, such as those stipulated in the Conservation Strategy for the Grizzly Bear in the Yellowstone Ecosystem. These were arrived at to ensure a coordinated, ecosystem-wide approach to managing habitat for grizzly bear population recovery. For example, in 1984 the Yellowstone Ecosystem Management Subcommittee identified the need to develop a cumulative effects assessment process for the ecosystem. The result was the development of the Cumulative Effects Model. It is designed to quantify individual and collective effects of land uses and activities in space and through time, and provide an analytical tool for evaluating alternative land use scenarios to grizzly bear recovery goals and objectives. The CEM addresses the scale of analysis as an important factor in cumulative effects assessment. In an area as large and diverse as the Yellowstone ecosystem, it is necessary to have smaller landscape divisions. The Yellowstone area is divided into 18 BMUs, which are further divided into 40 subunits. The BMU, or if delineated, the subunit, provide the basic scale of analysis. BMUs were delineated using grizzly bear radio-location data and topographic features. Areas were delineated that had a substantial number of radio-locations during spring, summer, and fall. Prominent topographic features between adjacent areas with 3-season use serve as unit boundaries. Subunits provide further landscape resolution as well as finer attunement to grizzly bear habitat use patterns. Subunits are delineated based on presence of seasonally available habitat components. This approach of using reestablished analysis areas is important because boundary placement can dramatically affect the outcome of project-specific analyses. Consequently, analysis areas are defined by biologically meaningful features that have shown significance to bears rather than political boundaries. In this way, determinations of analysis area boundaries are beyond the scope of individual project assessments and involve a concerted, science-based, multi-jurisdictional approach.
Jason and Suzanne Hahn		54		In addition to the methodology of Issue 10: Grizzly Bear not following the format utilized in the	Grizzly Bears	The concept of "mortality" or "population" sink refers to a geographic area where a disproportionate number of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				discussion of the other 23 issues, I find the fact that the EA written for the Beartooth Highway, Montana Forest Highway 59 was not cited or used in the analysis for the CCTPA to be unusual. The EA discusses fall grizzly bear habitat around the CCTPA to have the highest habitat values. It also identifies grizzly bear deaths tend to be centered around "population sinks".		bears have died from encounters with humans. These areas have a history of bear/human encounters because of attractants made available through human activities. The Cooke City Basin fits this description. Bears are drawn to the area because of relatively high quality habitat, especially whitebark pine forests. Bear/human conflicts have occurred largely because of uncontained garbage and attractants on private property. The Travel Plan is not designed to address attractant storage issues, although the goal of trying to keep bears and people apart in the Cooke City area was a consideration in the development of alternatives. For example, roads disperse people across the landscape, and, because people can make attractants accessible to bears, this increases the risk of bear/human confrontations. Many of the same concepts for assessing project effects on bears used for the highway reconstruction EA were applied in the consideration of Travel Plan alternative development. However, the two efforts have a separate focus and therefore the analysis documents for each were prepared differently. It is a good suggestion to apply the analysis and findings of the EA for the highway reconstruction to the Travel Plan analysis.
Jason and Suzanne Hahn		54		I would like to see the DEIS for the GNF Travel Management Plan be written using some of this same rationale to further improve the risk of Cooke City continuing to be a population sink for grizzly bears. Obliterating X.XX miles of existing ATV trails, putting September closures on existing trails, or creating the snowmobile closure south of US 212 in the CCTPA will not make dramatic steps towards taking Cooke City off of the list of grizzly bear "population sinks".	Grizzly Bears	The concept of "mortality" or "population" sink refers to a geographic area where a disproportionate number of bears have died from encounters with humans. These areas have a history of bear/human encounters because of attractants made available through human activities. The Cooke City Basin fits this description. Bears are drawn to the area because of relatively high quality habitat, especially whitebark pine forests. Bear/human conflicts have occurred largely because of uncontained garbage and attractants on private property. The Travel Plan is not designed to address attractant storage issues, although the goal of trying to keep bears and people apart in the Cooke City area was a consideration in the development of alternatives. For example, roads disperse people across the landscape, and, because people can make attractants accessible to bears, this increases the risk of bear/human confrontations. Many of the same concepts for assessing project effects on bears used for the highway reconstruction EA were applied in the consideration of Travel Plan alternative

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						development. However, the two efforts have a separate focus and therefore the analysis documents for each were prepared differently. It is a good suggestion to apply the analysis and findings of the EA for the highway reconstruction to the Travel Plan analysis.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Grizzly bears are sensitive to you human disturbances, as shown by a change in normal spatial and temporal patterns of habitat use. Where human presence is a factor in their use patterns, cover can become limiting and providing suitable habitat availability.	Grizzly Bears	In concept, we agree. However, the analysis used to address the effects of the Travel Plan alternatives on bears does not incorporate an evaluation of cover. Fortunately, the changes proposed in the Travel Plan would have very little effect on cover.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		there have been numerous studies on the effects of roads on grizzly bears, and all have shown negative impacts. Mattson recommended maximum road densities 0.6 miles per square mile, with .26 miles per square mile over the lifetime home range to provide for wary female bears in the Yellowstone area. Relative probability of occurrence on USFS multiple use lands was negatively associated with increased values of road density and declined to zero as road densities approached 6 km per square kilometer.	Grizzly Bears	We are aware of these findings. Elements of Forest Plan Amendment 19 and the Grizzly Conservation Strategy require assessments of total and open road densities and core (secure) area. Consequently, corresponding analyses were conducted for the Travel Plan to shape the proposed alternatives.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		In order to maintain predictability for grizzly bears and to avoid human-bear confrontations, the forest could consider seasonal restrictions in important food source foraging areas if areas are being actively used by grizzly bears. This can only be done through intensive monitoring of the condition of key grizzly bear food sources and monitoring of their use of these food sources.	Grizzly Bears	We proposed an annual fall road closure in the Sheep Mountain area in deference to bears foraging in the whitebark pine forests found there. However, in response to public comment, this element was dropped. Instead, employing a seasonal closure in the same area under unique circumstances to protect foraging bears was proposed. The intense monitoring of bear foraging patterns and food availability is desirable but beyond the scope of the Travel Plan.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Grizzly bears are sensitive to you human disturbances, as shown by a change in normal spatial and temporal patterns of habitat use. Where human presence is a factor in their use patterns, cover can become limiting and providing suitable habitat availability.	Grizzly Bears	In concept, we agree. However, the analysis used to address the effects of the Travel Plan alternatives on bears does not incorporate an evaluation of cover. Fortunately, the changes proposed in the Travel Plan would have very little effect on cover.
William and Carol Oriel		288		There do not appear to be sufficient facts to demonstrate that the grizzly population and/or their food sources need protection above and beyond the current guidelines. Are alternative ways suggested for minimizing negative human bear contact and alternative food sources such as secure garbage	Grizzly Bears	The intent of the Endangered Species Act is to protect habitat and individuals in order to ultimately recover the population. To accomplish this it is necessary to address habitat protection and mortality reduction for the species throughout its range. In this context, there is considerable debate regarding the long-term

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				dumps, elimination of external grease traps, discouragement of bird seed feedings, increased education to the public on adverse actions by the public upon the bear population, etc? If so, make it more readily available and have it reviewed by outside responsible parties.		sustainability of critical bear foods in the Yellowstone Ecosystem, such as whitebark pine and cutthroat trout. Availability of both food sources is compromised; one by blister rust and the pine beetle and the other by lake trout. Significant decreases in the abundance of either could be catastrophic for the Yellowstone grizzly bear. As mentioned, the other component of population recovery involves mortality reduction. This can be done by preventing bear/human encounters. Bear/human confrontations primarily occur because humans make attractants available. Because roads disperse people across the landscape, dealing with the number, location, and seasonal use of roads is relevant. Grizzly bear numbers are increasing but the population still faces many threats. Therefore, the population and their food sources do need protection. Securing attractants and educating the public to store food and garbage are good ways to reduce encounters and bear mortalities, but the mechanics of this are beyond the scope of the Travel Plan. Again, the advantage of the Travel Plan in promoting grizzly bear population recovery is in habitat protection and segregating bears and people through adjustments to road locations and seasonal availability.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		It was not clear how Travel Planning units blend with grizzly bear recovery habitat. Are the boundaries the same, if not, why not?	Grizzly Bears	No. Travel Plan analysis unit boundaries do not match the boundaries used to assess grizzly bear habitat quality or the project effects on bears. TPUs were delineated according to over-arching management prescriptions and associated transportation system patterns along with reasonable geographic/topographic boundaries. Grizzly bear Management Units and Subunits, elements of the cumulative effects model, were developed using a biological rationale. The different systems have different purposes. TPUs allow for an organized approach to making management decisions about the transportation system. The CEM analysis units allow for the effects to geographic areas to be addressed with known habitat features and configurations.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		The Travel Plan amendment, as well as the grizzly bear conservation strategy, assume without any specific data that the current conditions for road densities and security are "good enough." The localized impacts of these conditions on the bear are	Grizzly Bears	The standard for access management in the Yellowstone Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy is to " maintain secure habitat in bear management subunits at or above 1998 levels". Secure habitat is basically defined as any area more than 500 m from an open or

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				likely unequal, as is demonstrated in the expansion of grizzly bears mostly to the south of Yellowstone Park, rather than into the Gallatin Forest, for example. The claim that all current conditions for the bear are okay need to be supported with more than a general conclusion. In fact, the Travel Plan analysis identifies many areas that are problems. This in itself contradicts the assumption that existing conditions for the bear are "good enough".		gated motorized access route. The year 1998 was chosen as the baseline because this was the access level at which established grizzly bear population recovery parameters were met. The premise is that meeting the predetermined population recovery parameters reflects a healthy grizzly bear population. The fact that these recovery parameters were met in 1998 indicates that the bear population was capable of showing a positive growth pattern at those ecosystem-wide conditions; conditions which included road densities. The data used to reach these conclusions involve landscape level information collected by the Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team on grizzly population demographics, bear distribution, and permanent human constructed facilities such as roads and administrative sites. Grizzly bears have expanded their range north of YNP in recent decades, especially into the Gallatin Forest portion of the Absaroka Beartooth Wilderness. Even if standards in the Conservation Strategy and Forest Plan Amendment 19 are met, the Travel Plan revision still affords the opportunity to pursue site-specific grizzly bear habitat improvement.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		Another problem with the "good enough" assumption that existing security is enough for the grizzly bear is the fact that the population is not yet at the 500 bears that are needed for a viable population. This may require more, rather than less protection.	Grizzly Bears	Population demographic parameters used to determine recovery or the Yellowstone grizzly bear have been predetermined and are expressed in the Conservation Strategy. The Gallatin Forest Travel Plan is not the forum to establish or review those standards. Standards for management of Forest Service infrastructure, such as road, and habitat are stipulated in the Conservation Strategy. The Gallatin Forest Travel Plan incorporated those standards in the development of alternatives.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		There is no analysis of grizzly bear mortality risk in the Travel Plan DEIS. The current mortality risk to bears, as well as that which will occur with proposed alternatives, needs to be evaluated. How can a reasonable assessment of amendment impacts to the bear be done otherwise? How can decisions be made in regards to the best proposed action if mortality risks to the bear are not considered? These risks have to be looked at for localized areas, rather than at the bear management subunit.	Grizzly Bears	The Gallatin Forest Travel Plan is not the appropriate analysis document to perform a grizzly bear mortality risk assessment. The GNF, like other administrative units in the Yellowstone area, relies on demographic data and interpretation of those data in the context of the recovery process provided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Mortality issues are considered in the Travel Plan in the sense that the standards for not increasing total and open motorized access or decreasing core are adhered to. That is, it is known that roads (human access) present a risk to bears and an expansion of a

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						road system and corresponding decrease in core increases that risk. Adjustments to the GNF transportation system through the Travel Plan will not increase total and open road density or decrease core and thus will not conceptually increase the risk of bear mortalities.
Kevin Mack		946	Bethesda MD	I am concerned about increased use of snowmobiles and other forms of motorized recreation in an important elk and grizzly location. I urge you to designate the Porcupine-Buffalo Horn and Tom Miner basin as snowmobile free.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	We agree with your assessment of the importance of these Basins for wildlife. However, winter and summer motorized use in this area has a long-standing tradition. The development of alternatives reflects these issues. The selected alternative is an effort to respect traditional public use of the area and address wildlife habitat quality. While the Gallatin Forest will not attempt to increase motorized use in the area, based on legal precedent, it will not be possible to make these Basins motorized-free.
Bob Seibert		1040		The Porcupine-Buffalo Horn and Tom Miner Basin areas are important wildlife winter ranges. Snowmobile use should not occur there.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	We agree with your assessment of the importance of these Basins for wildlife. However, winter and summer motorized use in this area has a long-standing tradition. The development of alternatives reflects these issues. The selected alternative is an effort to respect traditional public use of the area and address wildlife habitat quality. While the Gallatin Forest will not attempt to increase motorized use in the area, based on legal precedent, it will not be possible to make these Basins motorized-free. In the preferred alternative, snowmobiling would be prohibited in Tom Minor Basin inside the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn Drainage. Snowmobile use on the Porcupine Buffalo Horn side would be confined to use along the Big Sky Trail. Please see the Record of Decision for additional discussion on winter recreation in these areas.
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		Alternative 7 takes some steps, in Gallatin #3, to rehabilitate critical habitat, by removing motorized use from Wilson Draw and Teepee Creek. Increasing the secure habitat on Gallatin #3 is a start, but using the Cumulative Effects Model, Gallatin #3 will still be below the 70% necessary for grizzly security. It will be important as time goes on to continue to close roads in order for this BMU to attain the level of security necessary to preserve the grizzly bear. One major step towards further rehabilitation would be prohibiting motorcycle use on	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	We agree that decreasing motorized access in Gallatin #3 will benefit the grizzly bear. In fact, Gallatin #3 is one of 3 subunits identified in the Conservation Strategy as "in need of improvement" in amount of secure habitat. At 55% it is below the 70% required. Proposed improvements through motorized road access closure in alternative 7 would increase secure habitat to 78% . Within the constraints of the Conservation Strategy, no further reductions in motorized access are necessary.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the Buffalo Horn Pass Trail #120.		
Monica Fella	Sierra Club, Grizzly Bear Project	661		The Sawtooth Travel Planning Area has more access into the area - this is actually in conflict with the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy document.	Sawtooth	The proposal to provide multiple access routes into the Sawtooth Planning Area is an artifact of earlier analysis. Only one trail is now being assessed. It involves the addition of a connector route across State land to an existing Forest Service trail, #297 (Horse Creek Trail). Forest Service trail #297 has been used by the public historically. A change in ownership of private ground at the entrance to Horse Creek ended public access. Once the historic entrance to Horse Creek was unavailable, members of the public hoping to use the Horse Creek trail began traveling across the State land. The Travel Plan proposal involves formalizing this route. Direction in the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy addresses motorized access. The status of open and total motorized access in 1998 provides a base-line. The Travel Plan proposal to identify a route across State land to provide access to an the existing Forest Trail does not involve motorized issues.
Steven Gehman		662		I am opposed to Object 1(2), which would provide for additional access routes from the north; this is a relatively small area that consists of excellent wildlife habitat and is used by a wide range of wildlife species; any increase in access and hunting pressure will reduce the habitat value and the high quality hunting experience that now exists.	Sawtooth	We agree that the Sawtooth area provides high quality wildlife habitat. This is, in part, because of a lack of clearly defined public access. Good hunting is likely a function of the relative isolation of the area. It is reasonable to pursue access into the Sawtooth TPA for the general public, especially to the existing trail, even if it means a less ideal hunting situation for the relative few who understand the attributes of the area and how to get there. The proposal to provide multiple access routes into the Sawtooth Planning Area is an artifact of earlier analysis. Only one trail is now being assessed. It involves the addition of a connector route across State land to an existing Forest Service trail, #297 (Horse Creek Trail). Forest Service trail #297 has been used by the public historically. A change in ownership of private ground at the entrance to Horse Creek ended public access. Once the historic entrance to Horse Creek was unavailable, members of the public hoping to use the Horse Creek trail began traveling across State land to reach the drainage. The Travel Plan proposal involves formalizing this route. Direction in the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy addresses motorized access. The status of open and total motorized access in 1998

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						provides a base-line. The Travel Plan proposal to identify a route across State land to provide access to an the existing Forest Trail does not involve motorized issues.
Brad Grein	Citizens For Balanced Use	1302		Proposed closures for snowmobiles are based on incomplete science that has not yet been formally peer reviewed and comes at a time when the numbers of Yellowstone grizzly, bald eagle and a gray wolf are increasing and exhibit healthy tendencies all leading to the process of being delisted.	Snowmobiles	In the preferred alternative, snowmobile closures are proposed for a variety of reasons: to protect important winter wildlife habitat, to provide non-motorized winter recreation opportunities, to protect wilderness character in the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area and in recommended wilderness, and to protect traditional cultural values in certain landscapes. Not all snowmobile closures proposed in the FEIS are based on wildlife issues. Please see the Record of Decision for detailed discussions on rationale for snowmobile proposals.
Jeremy Fatouros		1009	Livingston	Rock Creek: your reasoning to closing to motorized use is to protect grizzly bears. There are more grizzlies now than there was between 1960-2006 w/ motorized use. They want to de-list the grizzly.	Tom Miner Rock	The preferred alternative would manage the trails in the Rock Creek drainage for non-motorized uses in the summer, and would allow snowmobiling in the winter. The rationale for not allowing summer motorized use was in part to improve secure grizzly core habitat, and in part to provide opportunities for non-motorized recreation activities.
David Chambers		1059	Bozeman	Tom miner Basin/ Petrified Forest Trail (to Buffalo Pass): I believe this trail is in a grizzly recovery area, and I have seen grizzly bears on this trail. The day we hike this trail there were 10 motorcycles on the trail. The machines were extremely noisy and I'm sure disturbing to any wildlife nearby. the riders were taking their bikes off the trail into the meadows. Given the sensitivity of this area for wildlife, and with the petrified forest, this is not an appropriate trail for motorized use.	Tom Miner Rock	Alternatives 6 examined managing this route as non-motorized. The preferred alternative would allow motorcycles to use this trail from July 15 - September 5. The remainder of the year, the area would be managed for non-motorized recreation, including winter time. We believe we can allow this short season of motorized use on this route and still improve overall habitat conditions for grizzly bears in this area.
Mark Waite	B. Bar Ranch	1048	Emigrant	(from the seasonal gate on Tom Miner road) should be designated as snowmobile-free to protect wildlife winter range (and, as I spoke about with Ken Britton, since there is no way to access the area without trespassing over private B. Bar Ranch land to get to the trailhead) .	Tom Miner Rock	Alternative 5 evaluated managing this area primarily for cross country skiers. In the preferred alternative, Tom Minor Road #63 would be managed as a marked snowmobile and xc ski access above the gate on the western edge of section 16 to the campground and section 24. This route provides legal access through private land to the National Forest. Open snowmobile areas would be confined to the public land in section 24, to protect important sheep habitat in higher elevations.
Steven Gehman		662		I support Goal 3 ("provide grizzly bear and wildlife habitat security") and believe that to truly accomplish	Tom Miner Rock	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				this goal, and to make Goals 1 and 2 compatible with Goal 3, you should exclude motorized uses in this area during summer and winter, under all alternatives.		of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
William and Carol Oriel		288		there do not appear to be sufficient facts to demonstrate that the grizzly population and/or their food sources need protection above and beyond the current guidelines. Are alternative ways suggested for minimizing negative human bear contact and alternative food sources such as secure garbage dumps, elimination of the external grease traps, discouragement of birdseed feedings, increased education to the public on adverse actions by the public upon the bear populations, etc.? If so, make it more readily available and have it reviewed by outside responsible parties.	Grizzly Bears	The intent of the Endangered Species Act is to protect habitat and individuals in order to ultimately recover the population. To accomplish this it is necessary to address habitat protection and mortality reduction for the species throughout its range. In this context, there is considerable debate regarding the long-term sustainability of critical bear foods in the Yellowstone Ecosystem, such as whitebark pine and cutthroat trout. Availability of both food sources is compromised; one by blister rust and the pine beetle and the other by lake trout. Significant decreases in the abundance of either could be catastrophic for the Yellowstone grizzly bear. As mentioned, the other component of population recovery involves mortality reduction. This can be done by preventing bear/human encounters. Bear/human confrontations primarily occur because humans make attractants available. Because roads disperse people across the landscape, dealing with the number, location, and seasonal use of roads is relevant. Grizzly bear numbers are increasing but the population still faces many threats. Therefore, the population and their food sources do need protection. Securing attractants and educating the public to store food and garbage are good ways to reduce encounters and bear mortalities, but the mechanics of this are beyond the scope of the Travel Plan. Again, the advantage of the Travel Plan in promoting grizzly bear population recovery is in habitat protection and segregating bears and people through adjustments to road locations and seasonal availability.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		Trail #57, Buffalo Horn Lakes, is not labeled with its trail number on the DEIS maps and is not included in the tables for this travel area.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Trail #57 will be labeled on the maps with the Final EIS.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		We are concerned about leaving roads and trails open to motorized use in the Bangtail Botanical and Paleontological SIA. Setting this special area aside	Bangtails	The environmental analysis for the Bangtail SIA is being conducted with the EA scheduled for release in 2006. Motorized travel in the area is being reviewed and

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				is an excellent proposal however, in order to protect the area, we urge you to end motorized travel on Bishop Park Road #176 and end motorized use on the Bangtail Divide Trails #504 in its entirety. The entire should be off-limits to snowmobile use the protect the fossils, rock and mountain meadow that make this area unique.		includes mitigation as needed to protect the areas uniqueness. Currently, scientific studies needing protection are fenced. Paleontological excavations are likely not at risk to surface disturbances associated with motorized recreation. Vegetation could be at risk if repetitive snowmachine use occurs on areas blown free of snow. However, this would happen when the vegetation is dormant, it would be very localized, and if problems occur the area could be signed to protect specific areas. Other motorized uses would be restricted to designated routes.
Catherine Weeden		1604		Bear Canyon - this trail/road is highly impacted by motorized use. Another problem caused by motorized use is the spread of invasive weeds. Another way that weeds are spread in Bear Canyon is when snowmobiles run over hound's tongue seed heads that are sticking out above the snow and spread the seeds for sowing when the snow melts. This can be seen in the infestation on the west-facing hillsides in section 9.	Bear Canyon	Snowmobiles can spread weeds when the seed heads extend above the snow. The Invasive Weeds section in the FEIS will be revised to include snowmobiles as motorized vehicles.
Fred D. Opperman		544	Bozeman	Besides erosion, the spread of noxious weeds is very prevalent along the trails. The use of mechanized equipment has been proven to spread noxious weed seeds. Hyalite is such a beautiful area and it is being loved to death by all users. But not all users are hard on it. I truly would like to see that Hyalite area be designated a non-motorized area, both summer and winter.	Hyalite	Alternative 6 limits the amount of motorized vehicles (summer and winter) in Hyalite area. In Alternative 6 ATVs would not be allowed in Roadless Area and snowmobiles are limited to designated routes.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Weed infestation is a major problem, and we consider its impacts a compelling natural resource argument for eliminating OHV use from roadless areas. How will the Forest Service deal with invasive weeds and the resulting impact on wildlife, impacts that are clearly foreseeable results of its preferred alternative, if it does not manage roadless areas as motor free in summer?	Issues	Alternative 6 disclosed the effects of eliminating ATVs from Roadless Areas and consequently, the reduced risk of spreading weeds (DEIS page 3-257). If the Forest Supervisor selects the preferred alternative there will be a slight increase in risk of weed spread associated with motorized vehicles. To reduce the effects of weed spread, the Forest Service will monitor trails for early detection of new weed patches and treat patches when they are still small. Weed treatments are more successful and less costly when the infestations are limited in size. The treatment will involve hand pulling or herbicides. The impacts of weed treatment were analyzed in the 2005 Gallatin Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment EIS.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Gayleen Malone		1411		In response to issue 12 Invasive Weeds, the Travel Plan Document quotes a study done in Australia by Lonsdale and Lane. The F. S. document states that twice as many seeds were on four-wheel-drive vehicles than on 2 wheel drive vehicles. The authors were not quoted exactly as the document stated. They also stated that grasses were the most common species found on vehicles and not forbs. The Travel Plan Document states that 8,000 seeds were found on one vehicle. This was considered in the study. The wording in the document Is extremely misleading to the public and should be altered to show the true conclusion of the study.	Issues	This error will be corrected in the FEIS. Lonsdale and Lane's paper states that 52 percent of the vehicles carried one or more seeds. The mean number of seeds per car was 5.95, but three outliers strongly biased the mean. Without the outliers, the mean was 2.51 seeds per car. Most (66%) of the 88 different species collected were grass species, 34 % were forbs. Also their paper states "The analyses of variance showed that only one attribute, the type of vehicle, contributed significantly to the variance in log number of seeds... The 4WD vehicles carried significantly more (0.73 seeds/car) than 2WD vehicles (0.47 seeds/car)."
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		It is important that strategies for prevention, early detection of invasion, and control procedures for weeds be developed. EPA encourages efforts to develop an Integrated Pest Management Program consisting of prevention, education, biological control, herbicide control, mechanical control, and monitoring to control noxious weeds. All users of the Forest should be educated about the threat of noxious weeds, and about measure to reduce weed threats.	Issues	The Integrated Pest Management Program (including descriptions of the education, prevention, control methods, mitigation measures, monitoring and early detection) was described in the recent Record of Decision and FEIS for The Gallatin National Forest Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment Project (June 2005). The analysis tiers to the weeds EIS and will not be reiterated in the Travel Planning EIS.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	The DEIS on pg 3-253 states, "No research studies could be found that specifically evaluated whether the potential for weed spread was different depending on the mode of travel (e.g., ATVs, snowmobiles, mountain bikes, horses and people on foot). However, there does seem to be enough research to support the conclusion that weed spread has a greater association with motorized travel than non-motorized (Tyser and Worley 1992)." How can a conclusion be drawn if no research can be found? Not considering weed impact from livestock manure, hikers and hikers with unleashed dogs is discrimatory.	Issues	This paragraph will be revised in the FEIS to clarify the intended concept. Research has shown that motorized vehicles tend to have a greater association for spreading weeds than non-motorized vehicles (Tyser and Worley, 1992). The current weed inventory for the Gallatin National Forest shows this same correlation; more weeds are present along motorized routes than along non-motorized routes. However, except for the Londale and Lane research, there is no data that shows different types of motorized vehicles spread weeds at different rates. For example, ATVs are not proven to spread more weeds than snowmobiles, or pick-up trucks. Consequently, all forms of motorized vehicles were lumped together in the risk analysis. The route was considered to be at a higher risk to weed invasion if it was used by motorized vehicle than if it was used by non-motorized vehicle.
Marty Malone		103		You mention a Montana study by Sheley and Petroff that specifically states weeds seeds travel by "wind, people, water and animals". Yet this study is not	Issues	As stated in the DEIS (3-252), the effects of weed dispersal caused by wind, water and wildlife is not influenced by travel planning so these forms of dispersal

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				used in your conclusions, even though it was done by MSU.		were not included in the analysis.
Monica Pokorny	Montana Native Plant Society: Valley of the Flowers Chapter	332A	Bozeman	Roads provide good habitat for many invasive exotic weeds. Roadside habitat often lacks closed vegetation and usually receives more light and water. Diane Larsen documented that the distribution of invasive plants in two national parks on the Northern Great Plains and found that exotic weeds were more common along roadways than in less disturbed native habitat.	Issues	The DEIS (3-252 and 3-253) concurs with your assessment.
Monica Pokorny	Montana Native Plant Society: Valley of the Flowers Chapter	332A		The Montana Native Plant Society Encourages the Forest Service to limit road building and road used by motorized vehicles as much as possible in order to protect biological diversity, sustain the economic values of weed -- free land and maintain recreational opportunities for everyone. Motorized vehicles are the greatest source of weed spread on public lands because of their ability to travel long distances with undercarriages which allow them to pick up and spread weed seeds easily. Similarly, Montana Native Plant Society urges the Forest Service to curtail all on and off road vehicle use and prevent the unauthorized creation of the de-facto roads by off-road vehicles.	Issues	The effects of motorized travel on weed spread was addressed in the DEIS (pages 3-253 to 3-258). The amount of motorized travel within an area at high risk to weeds was the primary metric for evaluating the different alternatives. The unauthorized creation of de-facto roads was addressed in 2001 when the Regional Forester signed a decision that limits cross-country summer motorized travel. Alternatives 2 through 7-M will limit cross-country summer motorized travel and the creation of unauthorized roads
Monica Pokorny	Montana Native Plant Society: Valley of the Flowers Chapter	332A		Finally, That Montana Native Plant Society urges the development of vehicle cleaning stations where motorized use is allowed to clean vehicles up weed seed before traveling in the forest.	Issues	We do encourage people to clean their vehicles prior to entering the National Forest. Commercial car washes are currently available in most communities. Having additional vehicle cleaning stations near road leading into National Forest land is not financially feasible because there are so many different access points.
Bill Klenn/ Ellen Klenn		939	Bozeman	Since the FS recognizes that motorized vehicles offer the greatest potential for spreading noxious weeds, it makes sense that if we want to limit the spread of noxious weeds we should limit the use of motorized vehicles. Eliminating motorized traffic in all roadless areas would make enforcement easier.	Motorized (General)	Eliminating all motorized travel in roadless area to reduce the spread of weeds is similar to Alternative 6, which has no ATVs within roadless areas.
Richard Fisher		914	Great Falls	Motorized vehicles disturb sensitive habitats. Perhaps all types of travel can spread noxious weeds, but the motorized vehicle can do it faster and in greater proliferation.	Motorized (General)	We agree with your comment, and stated this same concept in the DEIS (pages 3-252 and 3-253).
Catherine R. Brandon		584		The weeds in the Tom Miner area is a big problem and I feel that any livestock needs to be quarantined for at least 3 days before going into the wilderness or	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Requiring all livestock (including horses) to be quarantined for at least 3 days prior to entering all Forest Service land is not a socially acceptable mitigation

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				other forest service areas.		measure, nor is it enforceable, so it was dismissed from further consideration.
Matt Lavin		757	Bozeman	A reduction in motorized vehicle traffic along unpaved roads and trails will lower the rates of a lien plant invasion, particularly in sensitive plant communities like riparian and wetlands areas, as well as at higher elevation as in white bark pine communities. I have since been informed that three major drainages (Truman's Gulch, and Middle Cottonwood Canyon) along the west side of the Bridger Mountains will not be protected from the damaging effects of motorized vehicle traffic. Who will control, the increased costs associated with such traffic, such as erosion control, invasive plant management, and ecosystem restoration once alien plants have invaded these natural ecosystems?	West Bridgers South	The Forest Service is responsible for controlling weeds on FS land and receives funding for managing weeds. Since there are more weeds than available funding, a treatment priority rating system was developed in the 2005 Gallatin National Forest Weeds FEIS (page 2-5). The priority rating system considers both the risk of weeds spreading and the probability of being successful in controlling the weeds. Areas with small infestations or new invader species will have a higher priority for treatment than large patches of common weed species.
Alaina Lammer Knight		629		Restore quiet recreation to the Cabin Creek Wildlife Management Area. This area has some of the best wildlife habitat on the Forest, yet snowmobile and motorcycle use are to be allowed in much of it.	Cabin Creek	A range of options for managing ATV and motorcycle use in the Cabin Creek area were analyzed in the alternatives. Seasonal restrictions on summer motorized travel were incorporated into all alternatives in order to protect facilities and wildlife habitat. Under Alternative 7-M, ATV's would only be allowed in the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area on the Oil Well Road Trail #68 and that portion of Trail #203 from its junction with Trail #68 to Pika Point. The Oil Well Road Trail #68 and a portion of Trail #203 are trails where ATV use is consistent with the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management (see Roadless Issue in FEIS). The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. Motorcycle and snowmobile use in the Cabin Creek area is allowed under the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area (see Roadless Issue in FEIS), as long as it is consistent with the "propagation and protection of wildlife". Summer and winter travel in the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area under Alternative 7-M were determined to be consistent

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						with this requirement of the Lee Metcalf Wilderness and Management Act of 1983 (see General Wildlife Issue in FEIS).
Beth Horn		238	West Yellowstone	I agree with restriction on motorized use in the Cabin Creek , Kirkwood, and Red Canyon area. Much of this terrain is fairly steep and not safe for motorized rides. In addition, it is excellent elk and moose habitat.	Cabin Creek	A range of options for managing ATV and motorcycle use in the Cabin Creek area were analyzed in the alternatives. Seasonal restrictions on summer motorized travel were incorporated into all alternatives in order to protect facilities and wildlife habitat. Under Alternative 7-M, ATV's would only be allowed in the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area on the Oil Well Road Trail #68 and that portion of Trail #203 from its junction with Trail #68 to Pika Point. The Oil Well Road Trail #68 and a portion of Trail #203 are trails where ATV use is consistent with the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management (see Roadless Issue in FEIS). The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. Motorcycle use in the Cabin Creek area is allowed under the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area (see Roadless Issue in FEIS), as long as it is consistent with the "propagation and protection of wildlife". Summer and winter travel in the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area under Alternative 7-M were determined to be consistent with this requirement of the Lee Metcalf Wilderness and Management Act of 1983 (see General Wildlife Issue in FEIS).
Beth Horn		238	West Yellowstone	I never understood why the closure for winter elk range between Red Canyon and Kirkwood did not extend to the area above the dam. There are several open slopes on the ridge above the new Kirkwood trailhead. When I have hikes up there in the spring I usually see lots of "trails" from tree well to tree well. I have also found "sheds" on these slopes. During the winter of 2003-04 snowmobiles used those slopes. During the spring of 2004 I found a few game trails in the old snow. The area is not	Cabin Creek	The loop area from Kirkwood Creek to Red Canyon and area west of Kirkwood Trailhead to above Hebgen Dam does not consistently support elk because in most winters the snow is too deep. Animals may occasionally winter in these locations during low snowpack years, but in most years there would be little benefit to wintering big game from restricting snowmobile use in these areas. Under all Alternatives, a snowmobile closure would continue to be implemented along the south facing slopes north of Hebgen Lake. The closure boundary

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				heavily used by snowmobiles now but as snowmobiles look for new places to access, I suspect it will get more use. The area was used again this winter. I have not yet been hiking there this spring to asertain whether elk trails have been made through the old snow. The sagebrush slopes and forest make this a good place for elk to traverse. I might also note the elk use the forests areas adjacent to open sagebrush above the snowmobile trail leading from Kirkwood to Red Canyon at he western end of the trail. I have seen their beds in the snow during more than one springtime.		was configured to prevent snowmobile use in the area that is consistently used by wintering big game, particularly elk.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		The seasonal restriction placed on motorcycles in the WMA seems to be an acknowledgement of the need to limit use. Are there monitoring studies planned and budgeted to insure that motorcycle use does not impact the wildlife values for which the WSA was established? Seasonal restrictions are not sufficient to mitigate wildlife disturbance because wildlife are attracted to this area year round.	Cabin Creek	A range of options for managing ATV and motorcycle use in the Cabin Creek area were analyzed in the alternatives. Seasonal restrictions on summer motorized travel were incorporated into all alternatives in order to protect facilities and wildlife habitat. The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. Motorcycle use in the Cabin Creek area is allowed under the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area (see Roadless Issue in FEIS), as long as it is consistent with the "propagation and protection of wildlife". Summer travel in the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area under Alternative 7-M was determined to be consistent with this requirement of the Lee Metcalf Wilderness and Management Act of 1983 (see General Wildlife Issue in FEIS). Monitoring of compliance with Forest travel restrictions by motorcycle users and other recreationists will occur in the Cabin Creek area as part of the duties of Forest Service Law Enforcement Officers, the Hebgen Lake Ranger District's OHV Ranger, Forest Protection Officers, and other Forest personnel. Monitoring studies designed to evaluate the impacts of motorcycle use and other types of travel on wildlife in the Cabin Creek area are not planned because the Forest has a high degree of confidence that the Travel Plan decision will provide high

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						quality wildlife habitat for the full range of species inhabiting the area, and therefore the Forest's limited resources would be better spent on other facets of Travel Plan implementation (such as ensuring that the public understands and complies with the Forest Travel Plan).
Kirk Horn		237	West Yellowstone	Snowmobiling use, Kirkwood trail loop to Red Canyon. In Kirkwood Creek drainage, prior to crossing over to the Red Canyon drainage, a herd of elk winter in this area and along the south shore of Hebgen lake "face". During the winter of 2004-2005, snowmobile tracks could be observed "weaving about" the elk beds in the snow. In accordance with your DEIS, this area will remain open to snowmobile use. As snowmobile use increases along the south shore of Hebgen Lake, leaving the Kirkwood Trail Loop open to snowmobile use is certainly not a beneficial management strategy for wintering big game, not to mention the noise and commotion generated in residential areas.	Cabin Creek	The loop area from Kirkwood Creek to Red Canyon and area west of Kirkwood trailhead to above Hebgen Dam does not consistently support elk because in most winters the snow is too deep. Animals may occasionally winter in these locations during low snowpack years, but in most years there would be little benefit to wintering big game from restricting snowmobile use in these areas. Under all Alternatives, a snowmobile closure would continue to be implemented along the south facing slopes north of Hebgen Lake. The closure boundary was configured to prevent snowmobile use in the area that is consistently used by wintering big game, particularly elk.
Noreen Breeding		454		Motorized use prescriptions must be coordinated with Montana FWP hunting regulations which specify no motorized hunting during certain seasons. Elk hunters on foot should not have to cope with disturbance by snowmobilers.	Cabin Creek	Under Montana law, "hunters may not use a motorized vehicle (including OHV's) or aircraft to concentrate, drive, rally, stir-up, corral, or harass game animals (2005 Montana Deer, Elk, Antelope Hunting Regulations, page 18)." However, use of motorized vehicles that is in compliance with Forest Service travel regulations for access to National Forest lands for hunting is allowed under Montana law. Providing areas for hunters seeking both non-motorized and motorized access was a consideration in the development of Alternative 7-M for the Cabin Creek area. In the Cabin Creek area, conflicts between snowmobiler users and elk hunters on foot was not determined to be a major issue driving changes in travel. Although exceptions occur, when adequate snow cover exists to allow snowmobile access in Cabin Creek there is generally little elk hunting opportunity available because most elk have migrated to areas with less snow or to the winter range area that would be closed to snowmobile use.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		We encourage the Forest Service to keep seasonal restrictions in place and monitor motorcycle use and Cabin Creek to make sure such use does not impact wildlife and wildlife habitat. We strongly support the	Cabin Creek	A range of options for managing ATV and motorcycle use in the Cabin Creek area were analyzed in the alternatives. Seasonal restrictions on summer motorized travel were incorporated into all alternatives in order to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Forest Service's proposal to close trails 205 and 2062 ATVs, and believe motorcycle uses inappropriate in the Cabin Creek Wildlife Management Area.		protect facilities and wildlife habitat. Under Alternative 7-M, ATV use would not be allowed on most trails in Cabin Creek because the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area does not allow ATV use on historically single track trails. Additionally, the Cabin Creek area is widely recognized as some of the highest-quality wildlife habitat on the Forest for a variety of species. The benefits to wildlife habitat from restricting ATV use in Cabin Creek under Alternative 7-M was a more important consideration than providing for recreational ATV use. Motorcycle use in the Cabin Creek area is allowed under the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area (see Roadless Issue in FEIS), as long as it is consistent with the "propagation and protection of wildlife". Summer and winter travel in the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area under Alternative 7-M were determined to be consistent with this requirement of the Lee Metcalf Wilderness and Management Act of 1983 (see General Wildlife Issue in FEIS). Monitoring of compliance with Forest travel restrictions by motorcycle users and other recreationists will occur in the Cabin Creek area as part of the duties of Forest Service Law Enforcement Officers, the Hebgen Lake Ranger District's OHV Ranger, Forest Protection Officers, and other Forest personnel. Monitoring of wildlife including grizzly bear and elk populations is conducted by other agencies in Cabin Creek and surrounding areas. This data would be available to help evaluate future effects of travel on wildlife populations in this area. Monitoring studies specifically designed to evaluate the effects of motorcycle use and other types of travel on wildlife in the Cabin Creek area are not planned. Alternative 7-M was designed in part to provide high quality wildlife habitat for the full range of species inhabiting the area, and the Forest's limited resources would be better spent on other facets of Travel Plan implementation (such as ensuring that the public understands and complies with the Forest Travel Plan).
Steven Gehman		662		I believe that Goal 3 ("manage motorized travel, both summer and winter, to maintain quality habitat for wildlife and provide for grizzly bear and big game security") should be the over-riding goal for this very	Cabin Creek	A range of options for managing ATV and motorcycle use in the Cabin Creek area were analyzed in the alternatives. Seasonal restrictions on summer motorized travel were incorporated into all alternatives in order to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				important wildlife area; to achieve this goal I believe that much more restrictive controls are necessary, including total closures to motorized uses on some trails such as Red Canyon (681), Lower Tepee Creek (208), Skyline (151), and Cabin Creek Divide (205, 206).		protect facilities and wildlife habitat. Under Alternative 7-M, ATV use would not be allowed on most trails in Cabin Creek because the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area does not allow ATV use on historically single track trails. Additionally, the Cabin Creek area is widely recognized as some of the highest-quality wildlife habitat on the Forest for a variety of species. The benefits to wildlife habitat from restricting ATV use in Cabin Creek under Alternative 7-M was a more important consideration than providing for recreational ATV use. Motorcycle use in the Cabin Creek area is allowed under the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area, as long as it is consistent with the "propagation and protection of wildlife". Summer and winter travel in the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area under Alternative 7-M were determined to be consistent with this requirement of the Lee Metcalf Wilderness and Management Act of 1983 (see General Wildlife Issue in FEIS).
Tom Weiss		646		I agree that trail #205 should have ATV restrictions for the proposed dates but maybe retain feeder trail numbers 207 (Cabin Creek) and 210 (Kirkwood) for 2 wheeled single track motorcycles. This may prevent congestion on the main trail #205. Also this would provide an escape route for users once the severely burned trees along trail #205 fall and block this trail.	Cabin Creek	A range of options for managing ATV and motorcycle use in the Cabin Creek area were analyzed in the alternatives. Seasonal restrictions on summer motorized travel were incorporated into all alternatives in order to protect facilities and wildlife habitat. Under Alternative 7-M, ATV use would not be allowed on most trails in Cabin Creek because the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area does not allow ATV use on historically single track trails. Additionally, the Cabin Creek area is widely recognized as some of the highest-quality wildlife habitat on the Forest for a variety of species. The benefits to wildlife habitat from restricting ATV use in Cabin Creek under Alternative 7-M was a more important consideration than providing for recreational ATV use. The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. Motorcycle use in the Cabin Creek area is allowed under the legislation establishing

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area, as long as it is consistent with the "propagation and protection of wildlife". Summer travel in the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area under Alternative 7-M was determined to be consistent with this requirement of the Lee Metcalf Wilderness and Management Act of 1983 (see General Wildlife Issue in FEIS).
Thomas F.T. Linfield,	State of Montana - Department of Livestock	1894		The Preferred Alternative also includes a goal that is specific to administrative access. We request revision of Goal J and Objective J-1 to include clarification that would permit the administrative use of ATVs and/or snowmobiles in the Hebgen Basin Travel Planning Area to achieve the purposes of IBMP.	Goals and Objectives	Forest Service line officers have the discretion to authorize or deny administrative use of motor vehicles by employees of other state and federal agencies unless engaged in emergency actions, response to violations of law, or use that is authorized under Federal regulations or law (36 CFR section 261.1a; section 261.13; and section 261.14).
Craig and Jackie Mathews	Blue Ribbon Flies	439		Trail 1720 between East Denny and Cream Creeks should remain closed to ATVs. This trail has been closed for years and has become secure grizzly bear habitat. It is a prime migration and travel corridor for grizzly, moose, elk and deer in and out of Montana, Yellowstone and Idaho. It is also the permitted horse tail for the Diamond P Horse ranch horse rental operation and, I hold a "special use permit" from the GNF to bring clients grouse hunting in the fall in this area. I would not want to hunt grouse in conflict with ATVs and my hunting clients.	Hebgen Basin	Consideration was given to restriction of summer motorized use on Forest Road #1720 in the Buttermilk and East Fork Denny Creek area under Alternatives 1-6, while ATV's and motorcycles would be allowed on this route under Alternative 7-M. The rationale for allowing ATV's and motorcycles on this route was to provide a legal and safe route for ATV and motorcycle users to ride from West Yellowstone to the Lionhead trail system without riding in the Highway 20 right-of-way as they currently do. The current ATV and motorcycle use occurring in the Highway 20 right-of-way is a major safety issue due to the close proximity of high-speed traffic. This route would have to be brought up to standard before it could be opened for public use. We recognize that opening this route to ATV's and motorcycles would affect grizzly bear and big game use of this specific area. Habitat for grizzly bears is analyzed and managed on the larger Bear Management Subunit (BMS) scale due to the large spatial requirements of this species. The Buttermilk and East Fork Denny Creek area is within the Henry' Lake #2 BMS. Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear habitat values for the Henry's Lake #2 BMS through additional restrictions on motorized use elsewhere in the BMS (primarily in the Henry's Lake Mountains) and is consistent with the Conservation Strategy for Grizzly Bears in the Greater Yellowstone Area (see analysis for Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS). The analysis of big game habitat for the FEIS recognized that

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						this area has open motorized route densities that exceed recommended levels for elk. However, public safety concerns outweighed the negative effects to wildlife of allowing ATV and motorcycle use on this route, especially when the wildlife habitat improvements that would result from motorized use restrictions elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District and Gallatin National Forest as proposed under Alternative 7-M are considered. Both outfitted day-use horseback and outfitter/guide bird hunting are permitted in this area. However, there are numerous other horseback routes in the area and it is one of approximately 20 areas permitted bird hunting areas available on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District.
Craig and Jackie Mathews	Blue Ribbon Flies	439		The Horse Butte Trail: no known number according to GNF biologist Andy Pils "slipped thru the cracks….and should have been closed to all motorized use". This trail must be closed to all motorized use to protect elk, moose, eagle and bison habitat. The grazing allotment was purchased in good faith to protect these animals and birds habitat.	Hebgen Basin	Forest Road #2530 would be managed as an administrative route closed to all motorized use under Alternative 7-M to improve habitat for wildlife (especially grizzly bears and bald eagles). It should be noted that no grazing allotments or grazing rights were purchased on National Forest Lands on Horse Butte. Rather, the grazing permit for the Horse Butte Allotment was vacated and the permittees were issued a new permit for an allotment on the Targhee National Forest.
Harold Mayo		1689	West Yellowstone	I am opposed to opening a ATV/OHV trail on Horse Butte. The grazing allotment was terminated for various reasons including wildlife and wildlife habitat protection. The USFS should not allow non-winter motorized use of this valuable calving area to protect the wildlife and prevent the continued spread of noxious weeds.	Hebgen Basin	Forest Road #2530 would be managed as an administrative route closed to all motorized use under Alternative 7-M to improve habitat for wildlife (especially grizzly bears and bald eagles). It should be noted that no grazing allotments or grazing rights were purchased on National Forest Lands on Horse Butte. Rather, the grazing permit for the Horse Butte Allotment was vacated and the permittees were issued a new permit for an allotment on the Targhee National Forest.
Harold Mayo		1689		I am opposed to opening the old logging roads/trails behind the Lazy Acres Subdivision to motorized use during the summer months for the reasons noted above and because there is a high potential for conflict between motorized users and the established horse back riding operation presently conducted by a long time permittee who is currently using those roads/trails.	Hebgen Basin	Consideration was given to restriction of summer motorized use on Forest Road #1720 in the Buttermilk and East Fork Denny Creek area under Alternatives 1-6, while ATV's and motorcycles would be allowed on this route under Alternative 7-M. The rationale for allowing ATV's and motorcycles on this route was to provide a legal and safe route for ATV and motorcycle users to ride from West Yellowstone to the Lionhead trail system without riding in the Highway 20 right-of-way as they currently do. The current ATV and motorcycle use occurring in the Highway 20 right-of-way is a major

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						safety issue due to the close proximity of high-speed traffic. This route would have to be brought up to standard before it could be opened for public use. We recognize that opening this route to ATV's and motorcycles would affect grizzly bear and big game use of this specific area. Habitat for grizzly bears is analyzed and managed on the larger Bear Management Subunit (BMS) scale due to the large spatial requirements of this species. The Buttermilk and East Fork Denny Creek area is within the Henry' Lake #2 BMS. Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear habitat values for the Henry's Lake #2 BMS through additional restrictions on motorized use elsewhere in the BMS (primarily in the Henry's Lake Mountains) and is consistent with the Conservation Strategy for Grizzly Bears in the Greater Yellowstone Area (see analysis for Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS). The analysis of big game habitat for the FEIS recognized that this area has open motorized route densities that exceed recommended levels for elk. However, public safety concerns outweighed the negative effects to wildlife of allowing ATV and motorcycle use on this route, especially when the wildlife habitat improvements that would result from motorized use restrictions elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District and Gallatin National Forest as proposed under Alternative 7-M are considered. Both outfitted day-use horseback and outfitter/guide bird hunting are permitted in this area. However, there are numerous other horseback routes in the area and it is one of approximately 20 areas permitted bird hunting areas available on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District.
Kirk Horn		237	West Yellowstone	Illegal snowmobile traffic, ignoring winter range closures. All of us are aware that, especclially non-local snowmobiles users, abuse resources and regulations. As Yellowstone National Park tightens down on snowmobile users, pressure will increase on NFS lands. However, the constant snowmobile use behind signed, closed, designated game winter range along the south shore of Hebgen Lake, especially from Happy Hour Bar west to Mile post 11 on Hwy 287 is unacceptable. While the DEIS designates the big game winter range closed, the problem of not having Law Enforcement Officers	Hebgen Basin	Enforcement is an important Travel Planning issue. The analysis of this issue in the FEIS recognized the Hebgen Basin and Cabin Creek areas as "hot spots" for travel management, and concludes that Alternatives 3 through 7-M are all more enforceable than the current condition. Enforcement of snowmobile restrictions in the North Hebgen winter range area as proposed under Alternative 7-M would be part of the duties of Forest Service Law Enforcement Officers, the Hebgen Lake Ranger District's OHV/Snow Ranger(s), and Forest Protection Officers.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				(LEOs) budgeted to administer the TMP is an ICO that needs recognition and consideration in the final TMP.		
Kirk Horn		237	West Yellowstone	The "Go Down" route to Hebgen Lake from FS Rd 167, South shore near the mouth of trapper Creek and continuation of motorized use beyond the Clark Springs summer Homes. If I understand the DEIS and discussions with Mr. Pils, this "Go Down" opportunity will continue to be open to summer motorized use in the final TMP. I feel strongly that this motorized "Go Down" opportunity should be re-evaluated and considered for non-motorized use. For the past 2 or 3 years, forest users have re-opened this "Go Down" opportunity to motor down to Hebgen Lake edge for camping and other recreation use. Prior to 2003, Canada Geese and mallard ducks nested along the shore in the use area discussed. If popularity of the site increases- which it will, sanitation will become an issue, if it is not already. Litter is already an issue. Currently, local citizens pick up litter during the summer. Toilet paper is increasing.	Hebgen Basin	Under Alternative 7-M, Forest Road #167 from the intersection with Trapper Creek to its end past Clark Springs would be designated as a backcountry road. The go-down road referenced in this comment would not be designated for motorized use under Alternative 7-M.
Ruth Haak		292	Cameron	Please consider prohibiting motorized use for ATVs and other ORV's to travel from the town of West Yellowstone to Targhee Pass and the Lionhead trails. These trails are south of and parallel to Highway 20, they cut through the Cream Creek area, a designated grizzly bear habitat, the Denny Creek area and continue along part of the Continental Divide Trail. The alternative to opening these trails would be to use both north and south sides of Highway 20; they also give easy access to Lionhead trails, without endangering wildlife and people who use these trails for hiking.	Hebgen Basin	Consideration was given to restriction of summer motorized use on Forest Road #1720 in the Cream Creek area under Alternatives 1-6, while ATV's and motorcycles would be allowed on this route under Alternative 7-M. The rationale for allowing ATV's and motorcycles on this route was to provide a legal and safe route for ATV and motorcycle users to ride from West Yellowstone to the Lionhead trail system without riding in the Highway 20 right-of-way as they currently do. The current ATV and motorcycle use occurring in the Highway 20 right-of-way is a major safety issue due to the close proximity of high-speed traffic. Hikers share many trails with ATV's and motorcycles on the Forest without safety problems and this route is similar to others where such shared use occurs. We recognize that opening this route to ATV's and motorcycles would affect grizzly bear and big game use of this specific area. Habitat for grizzly bears is analyzed and managed on the larger Bear Management Subunit (BMS) scale due to the large spatial requirements of this species. The Cream Creak area is within the Henry' Lake #2 BMS.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear habitat values for the Henry's Lake #2 BMS through additional restrictions on motorized use elsewhere in the BMS (primarily in the Henry's Lake Mountains) and is consistent with the Conservation Strategy for Grizzly Bears in the Greater Yellowstone Area (see analysis for Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS). The analysis of big game habitat for the FEIS recognized that this area has open motorized route densities that exceed recommended levels for elk. However, public safety concerns outweighed the negative effects to wildlife of allowing ATV and motorcycle use on this route, especially when the wildlife habitat improvements that would result from motorized use restrictions elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District and Gallatin National Forest as proposed under Alternative 7-M are considered.
Thomas F.T. Linfield,	State of Montana - Department of Livestock	1894	Helena	The Montana Board of Livestock requests that the final decision to adopt the travel plan honor the GNF previous decision to participate, as a cooperating agency, in the Interagency Bison Management Plan. The Preferred Alternative provides opportunities for snowmobiling in the Hebgen Basin Travel Planning Area, but restricts snowmobile use to the groomed and well maintained routes in the area. These restrictions seem to prohibit the administrative use of snowmobiles that is essential to efficient winter operations of the IBMP in the Western Boundary Area.	Hebgen Basin	No Travel Plan alternative would restrict snowmobiles to the groomed trail system throughout the entire Hebgen Basin TPA. Alternative 7-M would institute a snowmobile closure along portions of the Madison Arm, Madison River, and Duck/Cougar Creeks to protect winter wildlife habitat. The area south of Baker's Hole and between Highway 191 and the YNP boundary would also have a snowmobile closure to provide for a designated ski/snowshoe trail. Forest Service line officers have the discretion to authorize or deny administrative use of motor vehicles by employees of other state and federal agencies unless engaged in emergency actions, response to violations of law, or use that is authorized under Federal regulations or law (36 CFR section 261.1a; section 261.13; and section 261.14).
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		We have concerns that the preferred alternative will not meet many of the Greater Yellowstone Bald Eagle Management Plan guidelines in regard to open snowmobile routes and snowmobile activity near bald eagle nesting and foraging areas in the Horse Butte and Ridge and Narrows Territories. We recommend that additional snowmobile restrictions be incorporated into the preferred alternative to reduce disturbance to bald eagles during the early nesting period.	Issues	Alternatives 5 & 6 incorporated restrictions on snowmobile use off groomed trails on Horse Butte to improve habitat for bald eagles. The rationale for not including these restrictions in Alternative 7-M was: this area has long been extremely popular among snowmobilers and this alternative would continue to provide this opportunity for snowmobile use; and the analysis of bald eagle habitat in the FEIS showed that while effects to the Ridge and Horse Butte territories from snowmobile use would likely occur under Alternative 7-M, overall bald eagle productivity on Hebgen and Earthquake Lakes would remain good.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Conditions are similar to Hebgen Lake - Lionhead summer elk habitat with the eastern portion more heavily affected by motorized access while the west remains relatively free of motorized routes. The western portion has the potential to provide high quality, unfragmented summer elk habitat and can be improved by the FS proposal to remove motorcycle and ATV traffic on Coffin Lakes Trail, #209, seg. 1 and the Watkins Creek Trail #215, seg. 2 which extend into recommended wilderness. Same for mule deer, big horn sheep, and grizzly bears.	Lionhead	Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses to provide non-motorized recreational opportunities and improve grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat, while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use.
Brian Maffly		541	Bozeman	The Lionhead is an important wildlife corridor between Yellowstone Park, the Continental Divide and wilderness areas within the Madison Range.	Lionhead	The importance of this area as a wildlife corridor was recognized in the FEIS under the analysis of Biological Diversity and Ecological Sustainability.
Bruce Rich		1505	Bozeman	The road leading up to the old Lionhead ski area is a particular area which receives more than its fair share of motorized travel at this time. 4-wheeler traffic around the gate is common and the gate itself is frequently destroyed allowing full size vehicles to pass above . It would be very beneficial if motorized use off the main roads was ended after Labor day weekend to provide for habitat security in the archery hunting season.	Lionhead	Alternative 7-M was designed to separate motorized and non-motorized uses in the Lionhead TPA. During archery season, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would provide a large area for non-motorized access by hunters, while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's.
Cledith E. and Dinah P. Oakley		559		West Fork Watkins Trail #216 - This trail is the key east-west link between #217 and #215 - 209 and the west slope of the Proposed Wilderness Area, via #218, Sheep Lake Trail. Allowing snowmobiles into the heart of the proposed wilderness will invite users to continue down the western slope via the Sheep Creek drainage, proposed to be closed to snowmobiles in Alt. 7.	Lionhead	Trail #216 would be managed as closed to snowmobiles under all Travel Plan Alternatives.
Cledith E. and Dinah P. Oakley		559		Upper W. Denny Creek/Contour Connect - the proposed connector route is not needed for the public to access trails and roads which are proposed for motorized travel. Recessed "trails" already exist along both the north and south sides of Hwy. 20 and they are heavily used by ATV's, motorcycles, and snowmobiles. The existing wildlife corridor would be adversely affected by any new corridor created for motorized travel.	Lionhead	Consideration was given to restriction of summer motorized use on Forest Road #1720 in the Cream Creek area under Alternatives 1-6, while ATV's and motorcycles would be allowed on this route under Alternative 7-M. The rationale for allowing ATV's and motorcycles on this route was to provide a legal and safe route for ATV and motorcycle users to ride from West Yellowstone to the Lionhead trail system without riding in the Highway 20 right-of-way as they currently do. The current ATV and motorcycle use occurring in the Highway 20 right-of-way is a major safety issue due to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						the close proximity of high-speed traffic. Hikers share many trails with ATV's and motorcycles on the Forest without safety problems and this route is similar to others where such shared use occurs. We recognize that opening this route to ATV's and motorcycles would affect grizzly bear and big game use of this specific area. Habitat for grizzly bears is analyzed and managed on the larger Bear Management Subunit (BMS) scale due to the large spatial requirements of this species. The Cream Creak area is within the Henry' Lake #2 BMS. Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear habitat values for the Henry's Lake #2 BMS through additional restrictions on motorized use elsewhere in the BMS (primarily in the Henry's Lake Mountains) and is consistent with the Conservation Strategy for Grizzly Bears in the Greater Yellowstone Area (see analysis for Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS). The analysis of big game habitat for the FEIS recognized that this area has open motorized route densities that exceed recommended levels for elk. However, public safety concerns outweighed the negative effects to wildlife of allowing ATV and motorcycle use on this route, especially when the wildlife habitat improvements that would result from motorized use restrictions elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District and Gallatin National Forest as proposed under Alternative 7-M are considered.
Dan Alder	Humanity	874	West Yellowstone	Historically lynx, wolverine and grizzly bears have used the same area. Recently, only signs of wolverine persist.I believe in a corresponding increase in motorized use (snowmobiles) near the area is at least partially to blame. Closing the area would be a step in the right direction for wildlife.	Lionhead	Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses to provide non-motorized recreational opportunities and improve grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat, while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use.
Larry Jent		933	Bozeman	There has been a marked decrease in the quality of elk habitat in the area around Lionhead due to the influx of motorized four wheeler traffic.	Lionhead	Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses to provide non-motorized recreational opportunities and improve grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat, while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use.
Martin Steitz		268	Forest Lake, MN	This region of the Gallatin, which the Forest Service recommends for wilderness designation, should be protected from motorized use. The Lionhead is an important wildlife corridor between Yellowstone National Park, the Continental divide and Wilderness area within the Madison range. Snowmobiling and other motorized uses do not belong here.	Lionhead	Under Alternative 7-M, no summer motorized travel would be allowed in the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness area. Snowmobiles would be prohibited in most of the Recommended Wilderness during winter as well. The exception is that the snowmobile closure boundary in the Watkins Creek area would be on the ridge dividing Watkins and Coffin Creeks, which is within the Recommended Wilderness. This would be a more identifiable boundary to the public and would be easier to enforce. See the Wilderness, Wilderness Study Area, and Recommended Wilderness Issue in the FEIS for a discussion of snowmobile use in this area relative to consistency with Forest Service policy and the ability of the area to be designated as wilderness in the future.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We feel that it is one of the most deserving areas on the Forest for a motor-free designation. Its wilderness character as recognized in the Forest Service's recommendation, its value as a pivotal corridor for wildlife moving through the Yellowstone Region and as core grizzly bear habitat, and its largely high altitude, fragile relatively untouched terrain will all be protected by motor-free management.	Lionhead	Under Alternative 7-M, no summer motorized travel would be allowed in the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness area. Snowmobiles would be prohibited in most of the Recommended Wilderness during winter as well. The exception is that the snowmobile closure boundary in the Watkins Creek area would be on the ridge dividing Watkins and Coffin Creeks, which is within the Recommended Wilderness. This would be a more identifiable boundary to the public and would be easier to enforce. See the Wilderness, Wilderness Study Area, and Recommended Wilderness Issue in the FEIS for a discussion of snowmobile use in this area relative to consistency with Forest Service policy and the ability of the area to be designated as wilderness in the future.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Trapper Creek Road #2540 just east of the LRW is proposed for administrative use (primarily, we have been told, for the release of problem bears), as well as for mountain bike and snowmobile use. If this dead-end, remote road network could be obliterated, it would allow for the logical extension of the LRW to the east and for compatible, low-intensity use in critical wildlife habitat.	Lionhead	Obliteration of the road system in Trapper Creek was not considered under any alternative. There is a considerable investment in this road system, and under all alternatives it would be managed for administrative use to support a variety of potential future multiple-use projects.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		In addition, while we applaud efforts to limit snowmachine use in the Henry's Mountains, Alternative 7 does not go as far as is necessary for the best interest of the bear in that area. In fact, none of the alternatives do, considering the amount and intensity of snowmachine traffic in the area.	Lionhead	The effects of snowmobile use on grizzly bears on the Gallatin National Forest south of I-90 and in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS was analyzed in the FEIS. It concluded that snowmobiling may affect individual bears but generally these effects are not significant, and that there would be fewer effects relative to the current condition due to the increase in area of snowmobile closures.
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		In the Henry's Lake #2 BMU, Alternative 7 appears to create no improvement in habitat quality for grizzly bears. We strongly encourage GNF to lower the road density and/or close some roads in order to allow Henry's Lake #2 to achieve the 70% habitat effectiveness that is necessary for grizzly bear health.	South Plateau	The Conservation Strategy for Grizzly Bears in the Yellowstone Ecosystem identified the Henry's Lake #2 BMS as one of three subunits needing improvement in access values within the GYA, but did not specify a level of core habitat that needed to be achieved. Alternative 7-M would result in an increase in grizzly bear core habitat relative to the current condition and is in compliance with the Conservation Strategy (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Although we also recommend the designation "Area Close to Snowmobile except on Designated Routes" for the Horse Butte area, Duck/Cougar area, Madison River area, and areas along be South Fork of the Madison River based on wintering elk and moose, we also recognize the bison management complexities of these areas. We recognize administrative activities associated with bison hazing may occur in these areas. We would ask that we collectively limit administrative activity as much as possible, while still conducting activities consistent with the current Interagency Bison Management Plan.	South Plateau	Restriction of snowmobiles to designated routes on Horse Butte, Duck/ Cougar Creeks, Madison Arm and Madison River, and the South Fork of the Madison River was considered under Alternative 5 to protect elk and moose winter range. The closures on the Madison River, Madison Arm, Black Sands Spring area of the South Fork, and Duck/Cougar Creeks were included under Alternative 7-M. A closure on the South Fork north of U.S. 20 was not included in Alternative 7-M because snowmobile use in most of this area is limited by vegetation (heavy willows) and terrain, therefore actual benefits to closing it would be minimal. Additional closures in Horse Butte would not be adopted under Alternative 7-M because this area has long been extremely popular among snowmobilers and this alternative would continue to provide this opportunity for snowmobile use. Forest Service line officers have the discretion to authorize or deny administrative use of motor vehicles by employees of other state and federal agencies unless engaged in emergency actions, response to violations of law, or use that is authorized under Federal regulations or law (36 CFR section 261.1a; section 261.13; and section 261.14).
Tony Jewett and Tim Stevens	National Parks Conservation Association Northern	1452		NPCA supports efforts to restore motorized route densities in excessively roaded areas west of Yellowstone to one mile motorized access per square mile. We ask that the final proposed	South Plateau	Under Alternative 7-M, open motorized route densities would be >1 mi/sq mi in the South Plateau and Hebgen Basin TPA's. These areas have high open motorized densities in part because of the combination of major

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Rockies Regional Office			alternative provide for this level of restoration to the west of Yellowstone Park.		highways (i.e., U.S. 191, 287, and 20), county and private roads. Achieving an open motorized route density <1 mi/sq mi would probably require closing primary Forest access roads, which would severely limit public access to National Forest lands. The negative effects of high open motorized route densities to various species of wildlife in this area were noted in the FEIS (see General Wildlife, Grizzly Bear, and Big Game Issues). However, motorized uses would be restricted relative to the current condition in many other areas of the Hebgen Lake Ranger District, including areas with higher quality habitat for many wildlife species (i.e., Cabin Creek, Taylor Fork, Lionhead). The South Plateau and Hebgen Basin TPA's have the facilities in place to provide for motorized use, and managing them with an emphasis on motorized use would help meet the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Snowmobile Trailhead in Taylor Fork: we recommend the "Area Closed to Snowmobile except on Designated Routes" designation for the area south of Taylor Fork that includes lower Wapiti, Little Wapiti,... extending to the Sage Creek designation. The reason for this request is based on the area's importance to wintering moose and elk.	Taylor Fork	Under Alternative 7-M, the Sage Creek trailhead would become the main snowmobile access route to Carrot Basin. The Lower Wapiti area would be closed to snowmobile use to protect important big game winter range, particularly for moose.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Summer Motorized Use in Taylor Fork: continue with the Deadhorse year-round closure to limit impacts on elk calving and summer use as well as spring grizzly bear use. With the anticipated Cache Creek Road upgrade, implement the road closure as recommended in the planned upgrade to extended through the end of June. In the upgrades planned for the upper Taylor Fork Road, please consider engineering to new roadbed in such a way that maintains its primitive nature, i.e. keep it in a primitive condition suitable for high clearance vehicles only for reasons stated above.	Taylor Fork	Under Alternative 7-M, passenger vehicles would be allowed on segment 1 of the Buck Creek Road #136 because the high quality recreational opportunity provided would outweigh the negative effects to wildlife. Implementing a July15-September 15 season of use would mitigate effects of the road use on elk calving and spring grizzly bear use as well as big game habitat security during the hunting season. The Cache Creek Road #135 would be managed as backcountry road, with a June 16-December 1 season of use. The backcountry designation for the upper Taylor Fork Road would be consistent with the decision made in the Upper Taylor Fork Road Resurfacing and Gravel Pit project.
Steve Kroon		941	Bozeman	It is proposed to open up a road from the Cache Creek road up Taylor Fork towards Buck Creek. This is a popular area for wildlife to cross and would cause conflict for wildlife using it.	Taylor Fork	Passenger vehicles would be allowed on segment 1 of the Buck Creek Road because the high quality recreational opportunity provided would outweigh the negative effects to wildlife. Implementing a July15-

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						September 15 season of use would mitigate effects of the road use on elk calving and spring grizzly bear use as well as big game habitat security during the hunting season.
				The area between West Yellowstone and Taylors Fork is prime grizzly bear country; there is no reason for any motorized vehicles to be in that area.	Taylor Fork	While more restrictive of summer motorized travel than the current condition, Alternative 7-M provides for summer and winter motorized recreational opportunities in the Cabin Creek and Taylor Fork areas. This would contribute to meeting the Forest's goal of providing a diverse array of recreation opportunities for a variety of users while being compatible with the need to provide high-quality wildlife habitat. This is consistent with the language establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area (see Roadless Issue and General Wildlife Issues, FEIS).
Charlene Locke		511	Bozeman	I have stayed in the Cabin Creek cabin several times and have been surprised that the trail is open for motorized use. The wet soils and delicate plants are not compatible with such use.	Cabin Creek	Currently, both ATV's and motorcycles are allowed on Trail #238 accessing the Cabin Creek Cabin. Summer motorized access on this trail would be limited to motorcycles from July 15-October 30 under Alternative 7-M. Allowing motorcycle use on this route with seasonal restrictions will result in desired soil, trail tread, and vegetation condition.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We urge the FS to fully implement the terms of the law by closing the WMA in its entirety to ATVs. The proposal to continue to allow ATVs on the Oil Well Trail (#668) beyond the WMA boundary is not in keeping with the Act. While some might argue that, at one time, this was a road, the Act did not take this into consideration when the boundaries were drawn. Changing a designation from open to closed at the mid-point of a route, as is the case with the Oil Well trail, makes enforcement practically impossible. The ATV designation as proposed is not a quality opportunity, making it very tempting for ATV users to disregard the closure, or at least to be confused by the designation and therefore to drive beyond it.	Cabin Creek	Under Alternative 7-M, ATV's would only be allowed in the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area on the Oil Well Road Trail #68 and that portion of Trail #203 from its junction with Trail #68 to Pika Point. This was to provide a high-quality recreational opportunity for ATV users in a larger area where such opportunities were substantially reduced relative to the current condition. Pika Point was selected as the end point for ATV use on this trail because it is a definable landscape feature and the trail north of this point is not conducive to ATV use due to vegetation and trail condition. The Oil Well Road Trail #68 and a portion of Trail #203 are trails where ATV use is consistent with the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management (see Roadless Issue in FEIS).
Don Pierry		1481	West Yellowstone	Snowmobiles and ATVs: Trails 205, 207, 206 should be looped together to provide a challenging dirt bike ride and to be safer than riding high speed roads.	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area.
Donald Beadle		696	Bozeman	Cabin Creek is an area that deserves increased restrictions on motorized traffic. The trails I recommend closing to motorized vehicles year round include 205, 68, and 88. I dream of renting the Cabin Creek cabin in a time when I might not be exposed to motorized travel in any season.	Cabin Creek	While more restrictive of summer motorized travel than the current condition, Alternative 7-M provides for summer and winter motorized recreational opportunities in the Cabin Creek area. This would contribute to meeting the Forest's goal of providing a diverse array of recreation opportunities for a variety of users while being compatible with the need to provide high-quality wildlife habitat. This is consistent with the language establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area (see Roadless Issue and General Wildlife Issue, FEIS).
F.W. Howell	Parade Rest Guest Ranch	1085	West Yellowstone	My partner and I own the Parade Rest Guest Ranch and do not agree with the June 15th date recommended in the preferred alternative regarding the use of horses in the Witts/Lake/Johnson Lake/Cabin Creek area. Traditionally, we have had guests riding horses starting May 15th (give or take a few days either way) depending on the snow conditions on the trails. As the snow recedes, we travel further in the mountains as the trails permit. We recommend that we be allowed to use the National Forest starting about May 10th, as there would be a very detrimental impact on our guest ranch if the June 15th is adopted.	Cabin Creek	There would be no spring stock use restrictions for Trails #90 and 75, or any other trails within the Cabin Creek TPA, under Alternative 7-M. Spring stock restrictions were not included on these trails because the Forest Service has decided that such restrictions are not necessary to prevent trail damage.
Gary and Randell Pates	Pates Enterprises	247	Billings	Our main concern is the access to the national forest. We are the primary property owners on both sides of road # 6930 leading up to Johnson Canyon in the Gallatin National Forest. For those of you who	Cabin Creek	Our records indicate the easement of record allows the Forest to manage the road for any purpose necessary for the administration and enjoyment of the National Forest. We believe the current and planned uses

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				are not aware, the intent of the forest access road through our property was given to the government in 1944 per the War Production Board's request to access Pass Creek Mine for desperately needed ore. It was never our grandparent's intent to allow public access through our property. However history speaks for itself and additional traffic over the years has brought increased off-roading on our property as well as increased littering, loitering and degradation of our property and the forest. We are opposed to the promotion of additional traffic through our land or the expansion of improved off-road trails in the national forest if it creates additional traffic through our property. Currently our road is not maintained and has become impassable with any measurable amount of moisture.		identified in the Travel Plan alternatives are within our easement rights.
Joe Polus		1487		Segment 3 of the Red Cub Trail #205 - is a very important and valued section of trail to motorcycle users. Please re-open. This trail is the starting point for the "Hebgen to Hyalite - Gallatin Crest ride" - Maintaining the trail network necessary for this ride is the highest priority of single track motorcycle users.	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area.
Joe Polus		1487		Kirkwood Trail #210 - This trail ties directly into other system trails and would provide important high-quality looping opportunities in this area. Trailhead has recently been moved away from private land an disproved - making it an ideal starting point for motorcycles. The trail grows so tight with brush that	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				it is not be a desirable hiking trail during late spring and summer months.		recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area.
John A. Platt		322		I recently spent four days in the Cabin Creek Wildlife Management Area and feel there is much potential damage to occur from expanding access of motorized vehicles in that area, especially with the potential for the main North -- South trail to become something of a superhighway for ATV and motorcycle users.	Cabin Creek	Access in the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area would be more restrictive to both motorcycles and ATV's under Alternative 7-M relative to the current condition. Alternative 7-M provides a motorcycle route from Tepee Creek to the Taylor Fork as is currently allowed. ATV's are currently allowed on this entire route as well, but under Alternative 7-M would only be allowed on 2 segments of this route: from Tepee Trailhead to the Cabin Creek Divide on Trail #151 and from Wapiti Trailhead to Pika Point on Trail #68. ATV's were restricted on other routes due to language in the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management area which prohibits ATV use in most of this area, and to protect wildlife habitat.
Joshua Klatt		643	West Yellowstone	I believe that the changes that have been proposed for closures of roads and trails for the Teepee Creek Drainage, Cabin Creek (including Red Canyon and Kirkwood) Region as well as the Sheep Creek Trail are not needed. I have ridden all of these trails on a motorcycle since I was a child twenty years ago (including this year) and feel as though they have not changed in that time in regards to quality of the trails and harm to wildlife in general.	Cabin Creek	Under Alternative 7-M, public use of the Forest Service road system in the Tepee Creek, Cabin Creek, and Sheep Creek areas would be unchanged from the current situation. The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area. Motorized use restrictions to improve grizzly bear core habitat are justified. Providing core habitat was the primary focus of access management in the recent Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy for the Yellowstone area, and this concept was based upon the best available science. The Cabin Creek TPA is within the Madison #1 Bear Management Subunit (BMS). Much of the core habitat within the Madison #1 BMS is currently within Yellowstone National Park (see grizzly bear issue in FEIS), with relatively little in the Cabin Creek area. The Cabin Creek area has long been recognized for the extremely high quality grizzly bear habitat it provides, and for this reason improvements in core habitat will benefit grizzly bears and are warranted. Sheep Creek Trail #218 would not be designated for motorcycle use to provide a non-motorized opportunity.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Red Cub Trail 205: segment three this closure eliminates access to the Cabin Creek area by way of the Red Canyon Trail. This closure would put a tremendous amount of pressure and create overuse problems on the Tepee Creek Trailhead. Same for Cabin Creek Trail 207.	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Horse use is also very popular from the Red Canyon trailhead and early-season stock uses very damaging to the trail surface. Motorcycle used tends to smooth out the rough trail surface created from stock use an early season. This trail is currently in excellent condition and would remain that consistency with continued motorized use.	Cabin Creek	The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 would be designated for motorcycle use under Alternative 7-M because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. Motorcycle use on this trail would be restricted from October 31-July 14 to prevent spring trail damage and to limit disturbance and displacement of grizzly bears and big game during spring and early summer.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Kirkwood Trail 210: this trail has also had major work done to relocate the trailhead so access through private property has been eliminated and thus reducing the impact of public access on property rights. Also the last one half mile of this trail needs to be open to motorized use (single-track) to connect to Trail 205. The rationale for these closures to access the cabin Creek area are unjustified (grizzly recovery).	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area. The Grizzly Bear Issue within the FEIS discusses the justification for decreasing motorized access to improve grizzly bear secure habitat within the Cabin Creek TPA. This area has some of the highest quality habitat in this subunit yet it currently has relatively limited secure habitat due to the proliferation of motorized trails. The high value of grizzly bear habitat in this area warrants the more conservative approach to management of motorized uses on trails within this area under Alternative 7-M compared to the current condition.
Linda Ellison		1070	Bozeman	Motorized access to the Gallatin Crest from Teepee Creek is essential in that it has the ability to keep	Cabin Creek	Alternative 7-M provides a motorcycle route from Tepee Creek to the Gallatin Crest. The route would follow Trail

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				OHVs adjacent to and not on a major highway from a popular dispersed camping area on Taylor Fork.		#151 at the Tepee Trailhead, to Trails #205 and then #206 through Cabin Creek, to Trails #203 or #68 in the Wapiti area, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, to Trail #30, and then to the Gallatin Crest area via Buffalo Horn Trail #199. ATV's would only be allowed on 2 segments of this route: from Tepee Trailhead to the Cabin Creek Divide on Trail #151 and from Wapiti Trailhead to Pika Point on Trail #68. ATV's would be restricted on other portions of this route due to language in the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management area which prohibits ATV use in most of this area, and to protect wildlife habitat. Dispersed camping would be allowed at any point throughout the route described above.
Loren Blanksma		1194		Cabin Creek: The closure of both Cabin Creek Trail (207 to junction of 205) and Red Canyon trail (205 to Cabin Creek Divide) is excessive. At least one of these trails, preferably Cabin Creek Trail (207 to junction of 205) should remain open to motorcycles as a connector route between Cabin Creek and Hebgen lake. This seems like a fair compromise in light of the other trail closures not rails that are dead end trails such as Kirkwood trail, Johnson Lake, Cabin Creek divide and Teepee Basin. These closed trails coupled with the already closed trails of Mount Hebgen, Whit's Lake, Johnson Lake connector, Lower Teepee Trail, Skyline Trail, Carrot Basin, and Lightning Lake should provide plenty of non-motorized area for non-motorized users and wildlife. I did not encounter any other motorized users on the days that I rode this area, but I did see evidence of significant ATV use and double track ATV trails.	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area.
Mike Slevin		224	West Yellowstone	I would hope you would consider keeping 151 to 205 open and 205-206 open. So it can meet up with 203 this would allow ATVs to be able to make the trip from Teepee Creek to Taylor fork as it is now! I understand that the 40" restrictions was established 20 some odd years ago before the modern day ATVs came out. But if you consider that a horse with panions is great that 50" now in force they should not	Cabin Creek	ATV use on these trails was considered under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M would not allow ATV use on Trails #205 and 206 from the Cabin Creek Divide to the Taylor Fork because the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area only provides for motorized uses that were established prior to 1983 when the Lee Metcalf Wilderness Act was enacted (see Roadless Issue,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				be allowed through this area also? But since were all using 205 & 206 now you should leave it at 50. It would be less expensive for all involved by approaching Congress and having them change it from 40" to 50".		FEIS). ATV's or other 4-wheeled vehicles were not an established use of this trail in 1983 and are therefore not consistent with the Act.
Mike Slevin		224	West Yellowstone	Cub Creek "205" should be allowed open to ATVs for the 6 miles till it turns into a single track on top. This area allows visitors to see what a flash fire will do to a canyon and how it recovers. The area is also used by hunters by all, hikers, horseman, motorcyclist and ATVers.	Cabin Creek	ATV use on this trail segment was considered under Alternative 1, but would not be allowed past the Beaver/Cabin Creek Divide under Alternative 7-M because the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area only provides for motorized uses that were established prior to 1983 when the Lee Metcalf Wilderness Act was enacted (see Roadless Issue, FEIS). ATV's or other 4-wheeled vehicles were not an established use of this trail segment in 1983 and are therefore not consistent with the Act.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		We support the closure of trail to 210 motorcycles and ATVs and encourage the Forest Service to be consistent with its management prescriptions throughout the Cabin Creek area.	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area. Alternative 7-M would also restrict ATV's to 3 routes in or adjacent to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area due to language in the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management area which prohibits ATV use in most of this area, and to protect wildlife habitat.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		The Forest Service proposes trail 203 to be managed for motorcycle and ATV use. The designation of trail use dead ends at Pika Point, and fails to indicate what type of use will occur on the trail north of Pika Point. This is troubling. Trail 203 intersects with trail 74 which is managed for motorcycle use only. Mixed use in this area will likely be an enforcement nightmare. To avoid trespass and extensive trail damage we encourage the Forest Service to close trail 203 to motorized use.	Cabin Creek	Under Alternative 7-M, ATV's and motorcycles would only be allowed on that portion of Trail #203 from its junction with Trail #68 to Pika Point. North of Pika Point, Trail #203 would be designated for motorcycle use but not for ATV's, and Trail #74 would be managed for non-motorized use. This would provide separation of motorcycles and non-motorized users on parallel routes. ATV's would be allowed between Pika Point and Trail #68 to provide a high-quality recreational opportunity for ATV users in a larger area where such opportunities were substantially reduced relative to the current condition. Pika Point was selected as the end point for ATV use on this trail because it is a definable landscape feature and the trail north of this point is not conducive to ATV use due to vegetation and trail condition. The Oil Well Road Trail #68 and a portion of Trail #203 are trails where ATV use is consistent with the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management (see Roadless Issue in FEIS).
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Segment 3 of the Red Cub Trail #205 - is a very important and valued section of trail to M/C users - please reopen. Motorcycles use on this section of trail in late spring actually improves the condition of the trail by smoothing out the damage caused by horse users. This trail is the starting point for the Hebgen to Hyalite - Gallatin Crest Trail ride - maintaining the trail network necessary for this ride is the highest priority of single track motorcycle users. Since this section of trail has been improved by GNF it has become very enjoyable and popular trail for M/C riders.	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Kirkwood Tr #210 - currently open w/the exception of the last 1 mile - slated to be closed in Alt 7. Please leave open the currently open portion and re-open	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the last mile. This trail ties directly into other system trails and would provide important high quality looping opportunities in this area. Trail head has recently been moved away from private land and improved - making it an ideal starting point for motorcycles. Lower portion of trail grows entirely closed with brush if motorcycles don't use it during spring/summer months. Trail grows so tight with brush that it is not a desirable hiking trail during late spring and summer months.		opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Cabin Creek Tr #207 - Anoterh important trail to maintain looping opportunities and aid in dispersion of use. Please leave open.	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and to facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Trail # 200 & 206 leading into wilderness are acceptable closures.	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		The Oil Well Trail #68 is still to be open to four wheel ATVs over 40 inches wide, in conflict with the legislation which created the Cabin Creek WMA. ATVs should be stopped at the WMA border.	Cabin Creek	Under Alternative 7-M, ATV's would only be allowed in the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area on the Oil Well Road Trail #68 and that portion of Trail #203 from its junction with Trail #68 to Pika Point. This was to provide a high-quality recreational opportunity for ATV users in a larger area where such opportunities were substantially reduced relative to the current condition. Pika Point was selected as the end point for ATV use on this trail because it is a definable landscape feature and the trail north of this point is not conducive to ATV use due to vegetation and trail condition. The Oil Well Road Trail #68 and a portion of Trail #203 are trails where ATV use is consistent with the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management (see Roadless Issue in FEIS).
Scott Bosse		130	Bozeman	Close the area north of Hebgen Lake (Johnson Cr Drainage, Red Canyon Cr drainage, Kirkwood cr drainage, Cabin Creek drainage) to all motorized use until Dec 1 to protect high elevation hunting. Mgmt unit 362 is extremely popular for elk hunters like myself. It has resident elk and a large migratory herd that moves through in Nov and Dec. Virtually all these elk hunters hunt by foot or horseback. All it takes is a couple of snowmobiles to ruin the hunting for everyone in those drainages by spooking the elk. Closing this area to motorized use until Dec 1	Cabin Creek	Alternative 7-M would reduce ATV and motorcycle access in the Cabin Creek area during the elk hunting season relative to the current condition. Conflicts between snowmobiler users and elk hunters on foot was not determined to be a major issue driving changes in travel in the Cabin Creek area. Although exceptions occur, when adequate snow cover exists to allow snowmobile access in Cabin Creek there is generally little elk hunting opportunity available because most elk have migrated to areas with less snow.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				wouldn't impact snowmobiles much, since hardly anyone rides there recreationally until after the end of hunting season.		
Todd Orr		840		205 - Cub Creek - Suggest signing and managing as closed to ATV and allow trail to grass back over to a single track motorcycle trail as was previously. Reduces ATV hunting pressure and ATV/horse-outfitter conflicts in Cabin Creek. Very few hunters ride motorcycles while ATVs extremely popular with hunters. Suggest managing as closed during hunting season to reduce horse user and hunter conflicts.	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area. ATV's would continue to be allowed on the segment of Trail #205 from the Cub Creek Trailhead to the Beaver Creek-Cabin Creek Divide, and on Trail #151 from the Tepee Trailhead to the Cabin Creek Divide. This would provide some opportunities for hunting access by ATV users, but considerably less than the current situation.
Todd Orr		840		207 - Cabin Creek - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use. Consider installing some trail markers in areas where trail is faint to reduce multiple trails. Suggest managing as closed during hunting season to reduce horse user and hunter conflicts.	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area.
Todd Orr		840		210 - Kirkwood - Suggest managing as open to motorcycle through to intersection with 207 for a great loop ride. Suggest managing as closed during hunting season to reduce horse user and hunter conflicts.	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area.
Todd Orr		840		203 - Wapiti - Manage as is closed to motorized use.	Cabin Creek	Trail #203 from Potamogeton Park to the junction with Trail #206 would be managed for summer non-motorized use under Alternative 7-M.
Todd Orr		840		206 - Lookout Point - Manage as is for motorcycle use. Post signs as Wilderness boundary.	Cabin Creek	Motorcycle use on Trail #206 under Alternative 7-M was terminated at the junction of Trail #68 because this junction is an easily identifiable feature and it would avoid wilderness trespass.
Todd Orr		840		90 - Johnson Lake - suggest managing as open to motorcycle use. Suggest managing joining trail 236 as open to motorcycle use to complete a loop trail to Teepee to Red Canyon.	Cabin Creek	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area.
				Red Canyon Road &Tepee Creek Road: If you close the road you eliminate any late season snowmobile rides. This road has a ground surface and gets torn up very little.	Cabin Creek	The proposed seasonal restrictions on these roads from December 2nd to March 31st are designed, at least in part, to maintain these routes for snowmobiling. The restrictions apply to wheeled vehicles, not snowmobiles.
Bill Youngwith		1632	West Yellowstone	Snowmobile to Black Sands overlook and restroom area should be left open because of the interesting and pretty view. .	Hebgen Basin	Alternative 7-M incorporates a designated snowmobile route to the Black Sands Spring to provide snowmobile users an overlook.
Bill Youngwith		1632		Don't close the area between snowmobile trail and the Madison Arm Northside it's a cliff with a great view.	Hebgen Basin	The snowmobile closure boundary along the north side of the Madison River and Madison Arm of Hebgen Lake under Alternative 7-M would be along the top of the bluff to provide snowmobilers a scenic overlook and wildlife viewing opportunities while still protecting important winter wildlife habitat.
Bill Youngwith		1632		Leave access from campfire lodge tot he trail head at Quake Lake in the winter to snowmobile in and fish that area.	Hebgen Basin	Alternative 7-M incorporates a designated snowmobile route along the Ghost Village Road #989 to provide snowmobile access for winter fishing.
Bruce Rich		1505		Neither the current GNF map of the Alt 7 map show a trail up the EF of Denney Creek. For the past several years there has been an established horse trail on the main loop with several internal criss-crosses in this drainage. What I can confirm is heavy trail use, including riding right down the middle of the creek and one of its forks. This use of an improperly designed or maintained trail is causing rill erosion on certain pitches/slopes as well as destruction and natural bed at numerous crossings and places where horses are ridden up and/or down the stream. I would certainly like to see this practice to either be stopped or at least put under some type	Hebgen Basin	The Forest Service is aware of this specific example of resource damage caused by use of non-system horse trails in the East Fork of Denny Creek. The Hebgen Lake Ranger District is currently in the planning process for a rehabilitation project for this area. This would be a separate process from the Travel Plan.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				of limits for the trail system to protect resource values. Some remediation of existing damage is also necessary.		
Cornelia S Ives	Madison Fork Ranch	606	West Yellowstone	My comments pertain to one specific "ghost road" of the South Fork Bridge on Route 20 in West Yellowstone. Thus "ghost road" leads from route 20 directly to our property fence and private fishing pond. We are sick and tired of the rude abusive trespassers and poachers that continually use this road. Please close the ghost road and allow us, your neighbors, the peace and sanctuary of our property.	Hebgen Basin	This route was not designated for motorized use and would therefore be closed to all motorized use under Alternatives 2 through 7-M.
Don Pierry		1481		Snowmobiles and ATVs: The ridge along Madison arm should be open for tourists to view wildlife on the river.	Hebgen Basin	The snowmobile closure boundary along the north side of the Madison River and Madison Arm of Hebgen Lake under Alternative 7-M would be along the top of the bluff to provide snowmobilers a scenic overlook and wildlife viewing opportunities while still protecting important winter wildlife habitat. ATV's would be allowed on Forest Service Road #6697 paralleling the bluffs above the north side of the Madison River and Madison Arm of Hebgen Lake.
Doug Anderson		877	Morgan UT	My family and I really enjoy riding in the West Yellowstone area. If you close these areas to sleds I will never again be able to take in these views w/ my family. My parents are getting older and could never snow shoe into these places to view them.	Hebgen Basin	Winter travel in the Hebgen Basin TPA would continue to be managed with an emphasis on snowmobile use, featuring the same groomed trail system as currently exists as well as allowing off-trail travel in most areas. Snowmobile closures would be implemented for protection of winter wildlife habitat along portions of the Madison Arm, Madison River, and Duck/Cougar Creeks. The area south of Baker's Hole and between Highway 191 and the YNP boundary would also have a snowmobile closure to provide for a designated ski/snowshoe trail. These areas currently receive relatively little snowmobile use.
F.W. Howell	Parade Rest Guest Ranch	1085		I think you should open the snowmobile bridges located over the Madison River and Cougar Creek to allow ATVs to use them so they stay off the highway. This is becoming a real safety issue for ATVs to come onto the highway to cross the water.	Hebgen Basin	ATV's would be allowed to use the Madison River snowmobile bridge under Alternative 7-M. They would not be allowed to use the Cougar Creek bridge because all ATV trails in this area would be south of Cougar Creek and no ATV trails would cross Cougar Creek. This is consistent with the 1998 decision for construction of the Cougar Creek Bridge, which did not provide for its use by ATV's.
F.W. Howell	Parade Rest Guest Ranch	1085		Alt 7 recommends snowmobile closures on the North side of the Madison River to protect winter habitat for elk, moose, trumpeter swans, and bald eagles.	Hebgen Basin	The snowmobile closure boundary along the north side of the Madison River and Madison Arm of Hebgen Lake under Alternative 7-M would be along the top of the bluff

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Having been a guide for many years, I know this area provides opportunities to view wildlife and surrounding scenery. I recommend you extend the boundary to the Madison River bluff overlook to the south of the Horse Butte Trail boundary.		to provide snowmobilers a scenic overlook and wildlife viewing opportunities while still protecting important winter wildlife habitat.
F.W. Howell	Parade Rest Guest Ranch	1085		I recommend keeping the road access behind Campfire Lodge during the winter so snowmobilers have access for winter fishing.	Hebgen Basin	Alternative 7-M incorporates a designated snowmobile route along the Ghost Village Road #989 to provide snowmobile access for winter fishing.
F.W. Howell	Parade Rest Guest Ranch	1085		I recommend keeping Black Sands open, as it is a favorite area for winter campfires, cookouts, and wildlife viewing.	Hebgen Basin	Alternative 7-M incorporates a designated snowmobile route to the Black Sands Spring to provide snowmobile users an overlook.
F.W. Howell	Parade Rest Guest Ranch	1085		I think the snowmobile boundary in Watkins Creek should be on the ridge rather than in the bottom of the terrain.	Hebgen Basin	The snowmobile closure boundary in the Watkins Creek area under Alternative 7-M would be on the ridge dividing Watkins and Coffin Creeks, as opposed to Alternatives 1, 2, and 4-6 where the boundary would be Watkins Creek up to its head at the Continental Divide. Alternative 7-M would provide a more identifiable boundary to the public and would be easier to enforce.
Loren Blanksma		36		Hebgen Lake trails (#205, #202) should remain open to connect Cabin Creek to Hebgen Lake.	Hebgen Basin	The configuration of trails where motorcycle use would be allowed in the Cabin Creek area under Alternative 7-M were chosen to provide for motorcycle loop opportunities and facilitate a motorcycle route tying into the Taylor Fork and Gallatin Crest, while also providing for improved grizzly bear core habitat and non-motorized recreation opportunities within the Cabin Creek area. The Red Canyon segment of Trail #205 was designated for motorcycle use under this Alternative because public comments indicated that this trail in particular was very important to motorcycle users. The Kirkwood Trail #210 was designated for motorcycle use to provide an additional motorcycle loop opportunity within the Cabin Creek area. To compensate for these trails being designated for motorcycle use, Trails #203, #207, and that portion of #205 from the junction with Trail #210 west to the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area boundary, were not designated for motorized use to improve grizzly bear core habitat and provide for non-motorized opportunities in the Cabin Creek area.
Lynda Caine	Firehole Ranch	799	West Yellowstone	We have observed an enormous increase in the use of the south side of Hebgen Lake and the surrounding area in the last three years. We regularly witness camping all along the lake shore at	Hebgen Basin	The Forest Service recognized that resource impacts from dispersed camping along the Hebgen Lake Road #167 have increased in recent years. To address this concern, motorized travel for dispersed camping or any

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				any flat spot, groupings of six to eight trailers plus boats, ATVs, and motorcycles. We are concerned about degradation of the land, the introduction of noxious weeds, noise and safety concerns posed by off-road motorized vehicles. The narrow trails of this area are not compatible for multi-use as there is no room for people and horses to get out of an ATVs way. Therefore, we support the non-motorized designation for this area.		other purpose would be allowed only along designated routes off the Hebgen Lake Road. The Watkins Creek Trail #215 would be closed to summer motorized use under Alternative 7-M to separate motorized and non-motorized users and to improve grizzly bear core habitat.
Melissa Buller		1005	West Yellowstone	Rendezvous Ski Trails - Close to motorized use and reroute South Plateau snowmobile trail to avoid intersection w/ ski trail system. Increase x-c trail development in the Beaver Creek road area, Beaver Creek campground and Cabin Creek areas. Also the forest area north of West Yellowstone on the east side of Hwy 191 - could be developed as a dog friendly ski loop out to the Baker's Hole campground and back (roughly 12k)	Hebgen Basin	The Rendezvous Ski Trails would continue to be closed to snowmobile use under all alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the South Plateau snowmobile trail would be re-routed to leave West Yellowstone off Electric Street to avoid intersecting ski trails. Alternative 7-M also includes a marked ski trail from West Yellowstone to Baker's Hole Campground on the east side of Highway 191. Additional cross-country ski trail development in the Beaver Creek Campground, Beaver Creek Road, and Cabin Creek area were not considered under any alternative because it would not be consistent with current guidance for managing lynx habitat (see Lynx Issue, FEIS). A snowmobile closure around the Refuge Point Ski/Snowshoe Trail and Beaver Creek Campground was incorporated into Alternative 7-M to provide for a non-motorized experience.
Mike Klostrich		122	West Yellowstone	The second area I would like to comment on is Horse Butte snowmobile trail from Hwy 191 west your proposal is to close from that trail to the lake. I would like to see the closure from the cliff banks on to the lake, for the distance to the Horse Butte Mountain where the Forest Service look out tower is. This would be a natural barrier to use as it is in accessible from there down to the major area that needs protecting. Here again if it is closed from the trail south we will lose access for viewing wildlife and fishing access in the spring.	Hebgen Basin	The snowmobile closure boundary along the north side of the Madison River and Madison Arm of Hebgen Lake under Alternative 7-M would be along the top of the bluff to provide snowmobilers a scenic overlook and wildlife viewing opportunities while still protecting important winter wildlife habitat.
Mike Klostrich		122	West Yellowstone	The third area that I would like to comment on is from Campfire Lodge on below the Hebgen Dam. There is a road that is used for fishing access in the summer and we have used it for years in the spring for fishing access to the restrooms and gate. I would like to see this left open to snowmobile use.	Hebgen Basin	Alternative 7-M incorporates a designated snowmobile route along the Ghost Village Road #989 to provide snowmobile access for winter fishing.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Mike Polkowske	West Yellowstone Chamber of Commerce Grooming Committee	684	West Yellowstone	The preferred alternative recommends snowmobile closures on the North side of the Madison River. Our committee believes this area provides snowmobiler opportunities to view wildlife and surrounding scenery, so we are recommending the following: Extend the boundary to the Madison River Bluffs/Overlook to the south of the proposed Horse Butte Trail boundary.	Hebgen Basin	The snowmobile closure boundary along the north side of the Madison River and Madison Arm of Hebgen Lake under Alternative 7-M would be along the top of the bluff to provide snowmobilers a scenic overlook and wildlife viewing opportunities while still protecting important winter wildlife habitat.
Mike Polkowske	West Yellowstone Chamber of Commerce Grooming Committee	684		The preferred alternative recommends snowmobile closure for the road access behind Campfire Lodge during the winter. We propose continued snowmobile access during the winter to provide fishing access.	Hebgen Basin	Alternative 7-M incorporates a designated snowmobile route along the Ghost Village Road #989 to provide snowmobile access for winter fishing.
Mike Polkowske	West Yellowstone Chamber of Commerce Grooming Committee	684		The preferred alternative recommends closing access to the Black Sands area. We recommend this area remain open, providing a convenient area on the trail system for rest, eating, and wildlife/scenic opportunities.	Hebgen Basin	Alternative 7-M incorporates a designated snowmobile route to the Black Sands Spring to provide snowmobile users an overlook.
Mike Slevin		224	West Yellowstone	On trail 1727 the two roads in intersection 27 and 26-23 were old logging roads that lead to open areas and are great views and show how forests are being rejuvenated. They also provide for hunting area. The area within the Madison Arm Road & 191 & 20 is an area that we use for harvesting fire wood for personal use as well as for short bike rides or just a walk. This area is also hunted as is most of Hebgen Lake Ranger District on 191 from Hwy 20. There are several water access that don't show like to old fishery. There is still sections of paved road that many families use for swimming hole in the river and should not be closed- 291 section 5-6 have more access than the each shown- 1781 in section 4 & 5 is the straight route not the proposed closer along the Madison Arm would close off great views plus a water launching area for canoes and kayaks.	Hebgen Basin	Firewood gathering, hunting, and access to Hebgen Lake are recognized as important uses of the Hebgen Lake Basin and South Plateau TPA's. Summer travel in the Two Top and Madison Arm areas under Alternative 7-M were designed to continue emphasizing motorized use while maintaining or improving grizzly bear core habitat.
Mike Slevin		224	West Yellowstone	The area on Horse Butte is also a source for fire wood that the Forest Service encourages the harvesting of, and favorite hunting spots, I do not think that any of the area should be closed.	Hebgen Basin	Firewood gathering, hunting, and access to Hebgen Lake are recognized as important uses of the Hebgen Lake Basin and South Plateau TPA's. Summer travel in the Two Top and Madison Arm areas under Alternative 7-M were designed to continue emphasizing motorized use while maintaining or improving grizzly bear core

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						habitat.
Mike Slevin		224	West Yellowstone	Cougar Creek section 27 does not show the 3 pull off to the water 2 of which have day use area! Off Hwy 287 in section 10 there is a day camping area for fishing and other lake activities.	Hebgen Basin	Firewood gathering, hunting, and access to Hebgen Lake are recognized as important uses of the Hebgen Lake Basin and South Plateau TPA's. Summer travel in the Two Top and Madison Arm areas under Alternative 7-M were designed to continue emphasizing motorized use while maintaining or improving grizzly bear core habitat.
Patricia Brandon		739		Big Sky Snowmobile Trail in Hebgen Lake Basin is closed, why can't this route be used in the summer by ATVs?	Hebgen Basin	The portion of the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail in the Hebgen Lake TPA referenced in this comment is an over the snow route. It has vegetation cover and there is no tread present. New trail construction would be required to allow ATV or other motorized use, and the recreation opportunity this route would provide would be small relative to the investment required to construct the trail.
Vivian Linden		944	Bozeman	The Watkins Creek trail is not one to be closed. It is an established trail for 4 wheel traffic with no erosion as it is fairly flat.	Hebgen Basin	The Watkins Creek Trail #215 would be open to ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. It would be closed to ATV use under Alternative 7-M to separate motorized and non-motorized users and to improve grizzly bear core habitat. This trail is within the Henry' Lake #2 Bear Management Subunit and the need to improve grizzly bear core habitat in this area was discussed in the Grizzly Bear Issue of the FEIS.
Keri Kensinger		754	San Jose	Please act on and finalize a travel plan that will thoughtfully manage our roads and trails in the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness that will allow only non-motorized use and a snowmobile-free area.	Lee Metcalf Wilderness Travel Planning Area	Under Alternative 7-M, no summer motorized travel would be allowed in the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness area. Snowmobiles would be prohibited in most of the Recommended Wilderness during winter as well. The exception is that the snowmobile closure boundary in the Watkins Creek area would be on the ridge dividing Watkins and Coffin Creeks, which is within the Recommended Wilderness. This would be a more identifiable boundary to the public and would be easier to enforce. See the Wilderness, Wilderness Study Area, and Recommended Wilderness Issue in the FEIS for a discussion of snowmobile use in this area relative to consistency with Forest Service policy and the ability of the area to be designated as wilderness in the future.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		We urge the FS to prohibit mountain bike use within the recommended Wilderness area of the Lionhead TPA. Mountain bikes are mechanized equipment and not allowed in designated Wilderness areas. The FS should expressly prohibit mountain bike use	Lionhead	Alternative 6 was modified to close the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness Area to mountain bikes, while Alternative 7-M would continue to allow mountain bikes on trails in this area, including those that connect with trails in the Targhee Creek drainage on the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				within the recommended wilderness area which will not only protect its wilderness character but also prevent mountain bike use from becoming an established and ultimately contentious use.		adjoining Targhee National Forest where mountain biking is also allowed. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. See the Wilderness, Wilderness Study Area, and Recommended Wilderness Issue in the FEIS for a discussion of mountain bike use in this area relative to consistency with Forest Service policy and the ability of the area to be designated as wilderness in the future.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		We strongly disagree with the FS proposal to change the boundary of the recommended Wilderness to accommodate additional snowmobile use. The alteration of the recommended Wilderness boundary is an issue that should be addressed in the Forest Plan revision, not through the travel planning process.	Lionhead	The snowmobile closure boundary in the Watkins Creek area under Alternative 7-M would be on the ridge dividing Watkins and Coffin Creeks, as opposed to Alternatives 1, 2, and 4-6 where the boundary would be Watkins Creek up to its head at the Continental Divide. Alternative 7-M would provide a more identifiable boundary to the public and would be easier to enforce.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Remove motorcycle ant ATV traffic on Coffin Lakes Trail #209, seg. 1 and the Watkins Creek Trail #215, seg. 2 which extend into recommend wilderness.	Lionhead	The Watkins Creek Trail #215 and Coffin Lakes Trail #209 would be closed to summer motorized use under Alternative 7-M to separate motorized and non-motorized users and to improve grizzly bear core habitat.
Bob Seibert		1040		The Lionhead has experienced startling impacts from ATVs during the past six years. These impacts coincide with the West Yellowstone snowmobile rental shops expanding their business to include ATV rentals during the summer. The Lionhead area is not suited for, nor is it an appropriate place for, off road motorized use. This applies to both summer and winter motorized use.	Lionhead	Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. The Lionhead Mountain and Upper Watkins Creek area is a well-known and well-used destination for backcountry challenge snowmobile riding, and would continue to be managed for this use under Alternative 7-M. The snowmobile closure in the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness would be expanded on the north end to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						include Trapper Creek, an area that has become popular with backcountry skiers. This closure was expanded to protect moose winter range but would also ensure that both snowmobilers and skiers have opportunities in the Lionhead area.
Bruce Rich		1907	Bozeman	In this area and many others, it would be very beneficial if motorized use off the main roads was ended after labor day weekend to provide for habitat security in the archery hunting season. This would provide for quality hunting in areas easily accessed on foot instead of the game being pushed back up the hill by the wheeler reach distance up into the prime habitat. Also, quality of the recreational experience would be greatly enhanced. How about only allowing motorized access to interior trails for game retrieval only from 10A - 2P or 11A - 3P after archery season begins?	Lionhead	Alternative 7-M was designed to separate motorized and non-motorized uses in the Lionhead TPA. During archery season, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would provide a large area for non-motorized access by hunters, while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Daily time restrictions on ATV use were not considered in any alternative because of the enforcement problems this would present when trying to implement such restrictions over a large backcountry area.
Bryann Johnson		250	Spokane, Wa	There is currently a direct, suitable, and safe 2.4 mile trail paralleling Hwy 20 that ATVs and motorcycles now use when traveling from Cream Creek ATV trails to the ATV trails that head into the Lionshead area beginning at the Denny Creek Rd intersection of Hwy 20. Keeping the forest trail behind Lazy Acres non motorized should not be a connivance or represent any change from what ATVs and motorcycles are accustomed to doing at present. In the present location the ATV route does not disturb wildlife, increases the danger of fire in the forest or negatively impact the residents of Lazy Acres in any manner.	Lionhead	Consideration was given to restriction of summer motorized use on Forest Road #1720 in the Cream Creek area under Alternatives 1-6, while ATV's and motorcycles would be allowed on this route under Alternative 7-M. The rationale for allowing ATV's and motorcycles on this route was to provide a legal and safe route for ATV and motorcycle users to ride from West Yellowstone to the Lionhead trail system without riding in the Highway 20 right-of-way as they currently do. The current ATV and motorcycle use occurring in the Highway 20 right-of-way is a major safety issue due to the close proximity of high-speed traffic. Hikers share many trails with ATV's and motorcycles on the Forest without safety problems and this route is similar to others where such shared use occurs. We recognize that opening this route to ATV's and motorcycles would affect grizzly bear and big game use of this specific area. Habitat for grizzly bears is analyzed and managed on the larger Bear Management Subunit (BMS) scale due to the large spatial requirements of this species. The Cream Creak area is within the Henry' Lake #2 BMS. Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear habitat values for the Henry's Lake #2 BMS through additional restrictions on motorized use elsewhere in the BMS (primarily in the Henry's Lake Mountains) and is consistent with the Conservation Strategy for Grizzly Bears in the Greater

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Yellowstone Area (see analysis for Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS). The analysis of big game habitat for the FEIS recognized that this area has open motorized route densities that exceed recommended levels for elk. However, public safety concerns outweighed the negative effects to wildlife of allowing ATV and motorcycle use on this route, especially when the wildlife habitat improvements that would result from motorized use restrictions elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District and Gallatin National Forest as proposed under Alternative 7-M are considered.
Craig and Jackie Mathews	Blue Ribbon Flies	439	Cameron	In summer the Lionhead Trail Number 217 should be non-motorized. The GNF around West Yellowstone currently has too much motorized use. The GNF provides too few quiet recreational opportunities that diminish wildlife security areas, spread noxious weeds, degrade river and stream riparian areas and destroy valuable wildlife habitat.	Lionhead	Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's.
Craig and Jackie Mathews	Blue Ribbon Flies	439		In winter, snow machines should not be allowed on trail 215 in the Watkins Creek area. And, snow machines should be excluded in a clearly definable and enforceable method on the Continental Divide Trail to the east of Targhee Pass and the Continental Bowl area west of Targhee Pass so back country skiers and snowshoe folks can enjoy a quiet back country ski experience.	Lionhead	The Lionhead Mountain and Upper Watkins Creek area is a well-known and well-used destination for backcountry challenge snowmobile riding, and would continue to be managed for this use under Alternative 7-M. The snowmobile closure in the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness would be expanded on the north end to include Trapper Creek, an area that has become popular with backcountry skiers. This closure was expanded to protect moose winter range but would also ensure that both snowmobilers and skiers have opportunities in the Lionhead area. Designation of the Continental Divide Trail as a ski/snowshoe route south of Targhee Pass was considered in Alternatives 3, 4, and 6, but was not included under Alternative 7-M. This route would not provide a quality ski/snowshoe experience unless a snowmobile closure encompassing the surrounding area was also included. A snowmobile closure in this area would be difficult to enforce given the high level of snowmobile use occurring in the South Plateau TPA, and when the amount of additional higher-priority closures proposed elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District under Alternative 7-M are

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						considered. The Continental Bowl area would be open to snowmobiles under Alternative 7-M, but this area receives little or no snowmobile use currently and is terrain-limited for snowmobiles. Additionally, a snowmobile closure in this area would be difficult to enforce when the amount of additional higher-priority closures proposed elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District under Alternative 7-M are considered.
Dan Alder		874		I've witnessed many summer motorized violations originating from illegal motorcycle routes in the area. Closing the Sheep Lake and Coffin Lakes trail to motorized use would help to curb off trail riding in the area.	Lionhead	The Sheep Lake Trail #218 and Coffin Lakes Trail #209 would be closed to summer motorized use under Alternative 7-M to separate motorized and non-motorized users and to improve grizzly bear core habitat (in the case of Trail #209).
Dan Alder		874		The decision to open Coffin Ridge to snowmobile travel is disturbing. This would justify poaching behavior and encourage a lack of respect for existing closures.	Lionhead	The snowmobile closure boundary in the Watkins Creek area under Alternative 7-M would be on the ridge dividing Watkins and Coffin Creeks, as opposed to Alternatives 1, 2, and 4-6 where the boundary would be Watkins Creek up to its head at the Continental Divide. Alternative 7-M would provide a more identifiable boundary to the public and would be easier to enforce.
Diana M. Christie		381	West Yellowstone	I strongly feel Lionhead Trail #217, in the summer, and Watkins Creek 215, in the winter, should be closed to motorized traffic. Plus cross country skiers should have an opportunity to enjoy their quiet time in the Targhee area.	Lionhead	Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. The Lionhead Mountain and Upper Watkins Creek area is a well-known and well-used destination for backcountry challenge snowmobile riding, and would continue to be managed for this use under Alternative 7-M. The snowmobile closure in the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness would be expanded on the north end to include Trapper Creek, an area that has become popular with backcountry skiers. This closure was expanded to protect moose winter range but would also ensure that both snowmobilers and skiers have opportunities in the Lionhead area.
Doug Chabot		1229		I would like to see Kirkwood Ridge and Hebgen Peak open to snowmobiling. This area is popular for riding	Lionhead	Kirkwood Ridge and the summit of Mount Hebgen would both be open to snowmobiles under all alternatives

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				and has unique terrain that naturally separates snowmobilers and skiers. The low angled hills provide great boon docking for riders, yet the steeper hills off the ridge are completely inaccessible to snowmobilers which make for great ski runs.		except Alternative 6. Under all alternatives, a snowmobile closure would continue to be implemented along the south facing slopes of Hebgen Lake. This closure boundary was configured to prevent snowmobile use in the area that is consistently used by wintering big game, particularly elk.
Jerome Onsager		955	Bozeman	Many of the trails in the Lionhead area are closed to motorized, which is commendable. Some trails in the recommended wilderness which penetrate the high fragile alpine core are open to bicycles and snowmobiles. These should be maintained as (a non-mechanized area).	Lionhead	We apologize but it appears that we errored during the content analysis in regard to this comment. It was not made by Mr. Onsager in his letter of July 29, 2005 and it's not possible at this point to determine who actually might have expressed it. In response however, at the time of this comment response, a final decision has not been reached over the management of the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness. Please refer to the final decision map and the Record of Decision for information on how travel will be managed in this area and the rationale for that decision.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Ski Hill Trail 114: the trail now provides another access to Watkins Creek Trail 215 relieving over use pressure from Lionhead trail 217.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including Trails #114 and 217. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Coffin Lakes Trail 209 Segments One and Two: This trail provides access to Coffin Lake from Watkins Creek Trail 215. Great views of the Lionhead mountains are available from the scenic trail accessing one of the few lakes in this area.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Watkins Creek Trail 215 segments one, two, three: segment one of this trail is very important to connect trails West fork Watkins 216 and Sheep Lake Trail 218. This provides a connection from the East side of Lionhead to the west side towards Reynolds Pass. Segments two and three are important to connect to the Continental Divide Trail system at the top of the divide. This whole trail is a core area connector route that ties numerous trails together providing excellent singletrack motorized opportunities in the Lionhead area	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Kirk Hewitt		1334		West Fork Watkins Trail 216: I have seen very few other users on this trail over many years of motorcycle rides on it. The only other users I have experienced our horse users and hunters with no conflicts.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Sheep Lake Trail 218: this trail accesses one of the most beautiful lakes in the Lionhead area. It sees very little use than it is in excellent condition after many years of motorcycle use. It's also a key connector trail to the east side of the Lionhead area via trails 216 and 215.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Coffin Lakes 209, Watkins Creek 215, and Sheep Lake 218: through many years of snowmobiling in this area, I have never once seen any other type of use here. This backcountry area is so remote that snowmobile use is the only one utilized to access it. With so much area available for non-motorized experiences close to West Yellowstone why take more motorized opportunities from the people that have enjoyed this type of recreation for years.	Lionhead	Under Alternative 7-M, snowmobiles would be prohibited in most of the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness Area. The exception is that the snowmobile closure boundary in the Watkins Creek area would be on the ridge dividing Watkins and Coffin Creeks, which is within the Recommended Wilderness. This would be a more identifiable boundary to the public and would be easier to enforce.
Lewis Smith		113	West Yellowstone	The Sheep Mountain/Lionshead backcountry are currently open and with no evidence of over use by responsible users is present. Restricted access would compromise the rights of US citizens to (?) with no damage.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Linda Ellison		1070		The Mile Creek CDST allows for segregation of motorized and non-motorized use within the area, and continuing the mixed use of the current direction on sheep Creek, West fork Watkins Trail 216, Watkins trail 215, Lionhead Trail 217, and Ski Hill Trail 114 would allow an excellent motorized opportunity that is economically important to the communities of West Yellowstone and Island Park.	Lionhead	The Mile Creek Trail #214, Watkins Creek Trail #215, West Fork Watkins Trail #216, Sheep Lake Trail #218, and Coffin Lakes Trail #209 would be closed to summer motorized use under Alternative 7-M to separate motorized and non-motorized users and to improve grizzly bear core habitat (in the case of Trails #209, 215, and 216).
Loren Blanksma		1194		Lionhead: The CDT trail (114) should remain open to motorize and the proposal to create a new adjacent non-motorized CDT trail seems reasonable.	Lionhead	Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's.
Loren Blanksma		1194		Watkins Creek trail is a lightly used low-impact mostly single track and should remain open to motorcycles.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Loren Blanksma		1194		Sheep Lake Trail is also a remote an lightly used low impact single track trail that has recently been renovated and is well suited as a motorcycle destination trail to Sheep Lake and should also remain open to motorcycles.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Loren Blanksma		1194		The West Fork of Watkins Creek Trail in combination with Coffin Lake trail would be opened to motorcycles. This would provide a good connector route from the upper Madison Valley to Hebgen Lake and simultaneously provide a good destination trail to Coffin Lakes. This would be justified in light of the fact that the CDT trail from Little Mile Creek through	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Idaho to the junction of the Lionhead trail is already a non-motorized opportunity area.		for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Loren Blanksma		1194		I agree with the preferred alterative plan to leave the Lionhead trail open to motorcycles. There are several road closures (2525, 2544, and 1743) in addition the already closed Trapper Creek road (2540). I do not object to these road closures because they provide a large non-motorized area, but the balance of the Lionhead trails are remote, lightly used low impact trails and should remain open to motorcycle use.	Lionhead	Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS). Forest Roads 2525, 2544, and 1743 would be managed under all alternatives as administrative or project routes that are closed to public motorized use, which is the same as how these roads are currently managed.
Mitchell Sander		340	Florida	On two separate occasions my wife and I have had the pleasure of hunting the Sheep Creek Trail and trail 217 in the Gallatin National Forest. The attraction of this hunt was the remote horseback wilderness experience. It will be a tremendous loss of the area is open to motorized traffic.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Pat MkKenna	Montanans for Quiet Recreation	949	West Yellowstone	Lionhead trail #217 should be non-motorized. The forest around West Yellowstone is already disproportionately over-motorized and provides too	Lionhead	Trail #217 above the West Denny Road would be closed to summer motorized use under Alternative 6. Alternative 7-M would manage Trail #217 for ATV and

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				few quiet recreation opportunities. Expand the snowmachine closure to include Watkins Creek trail #215. Close to snowmachines a clearly definable, enforceable area to provide an opportunity for a quiet, powder backcountry ski experience.		motorcycle use to help meet the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources. Alternative 7-M would result in a substantial reduction in backcountry trail opportunities for ATV's across the Hebgen Lake Ranger District and Gallatin National Forest. The Upper Watkins Creek area is a well-known and well-used destination for backcountry challenge snowmobile riding, and would continue to be managed for this use under Alternative 7-M. The snowmobile closure in the Lionhead area would be expanded to include Trapper Creek, an area that has become popular with backcountry skiers. This closure was expanded to protect moose winter range but would also ensure that both snowmobilers and skiers have opportunities in the Lionhead area.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		We support the proposal to relocate Ski Hill Trail 114, a component of the Continental Divide Trail, to a new nonmotorized route. We also strongly recommend that the old trail be obliterated where it approaches the open, high country east of Lionhead Mountain. New routing should make it possible to continue to maintain a loop trail for snowmobilers without encroaching on the sensitive high country.	Lionhead	No Travel Plan alternative would relocate Trail #114. This trail would be managed for summer and winter motorized use under all alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, a new non-motorized route would be constructed parallel to Trail #114 to provide Continental Divide Trail users with a non-motorized route.
Patricia Dowd		1261		I support the proposal for Republic Mountain, but disagree with the provision in the preferred alternative for the Lionhead that establishes a snowmobile area within the Recommended Wilderness.	Lionhead	The entire Lionhead Recommended Wilderness Area would be closed to snowmobile use under Alternatives 1-5. Alternative 6 was modified to include an expanded snowmobile closure area on a more identifiable boundary in Upper Watkins Creek and encompassing the entire Recommended Wilderness Area. Under Alternative 7-M, snowmobiles would be managed the same except that the snowmobile closure boundary in the Watkins Creek area would be on the ridge dividing Watkins and Coffin Creeks, which is within the Recommended Wilderness. This would be a more identifiable boundary to the public and would be easier to enforce.
Peggy A. Lynn		342	West Yellowstone	Summer-I support closer to motorized use in the Lionhead area.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Peggy A. Lynn		342		Summer-the Lionhead Trail 217 should be nonmotorized. Just as everyone has a right to access on public lands, I feel I have the right to enjoy quiet recreational use in appropriate areas. Technology and motorized vehicles (summer and winter) have made previously inaccessible areas now very accessible, greatly expanding the number of square miles and trails in use by motorized recreationists. So, in effect, trail closures are not taking away traditional opportunities from motorized public users. Rather, the closures are now necessary to draw boundaries and preserve some of those areas historically used for quiet recreational pursuits-pursuits enjoyed by a substantial number of people with diverse needs.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Peggy A. Lynn		342		Winter-the snow machine closure at the Lionhead area include Watkins Creek Trail 215. Close to snow machines a clearly definable, enforceable area around the Continental Divide Trail on the east (South) of Targhee Pass in the Continental Bowl Area on the west (North) of Targhee Pass. Just as everyone has a right to access on public lands, I feel I have the right to enjoy quiet recreational use in appropriate areas. Technology and motorized vehicles (summer and winter) have made previously inaccessible areas now very accessible, greatly expanding the number of square miles and trails in use by motorized recreationists. So, in effect, trail closures are not taking away traditional opportunities from motorized public users. Rather, the closures are now necessary to draw boundaries and preserve some of those areas historically used for quiet recreational pursuits-pursuits enjoyed by a substantial number of people with diverse needs.	Lionhead	The Lionhead Mountain and Upper Watkins Creek area is a well-known and well-used destination for backcountry challenge snowmobile riding, and would continue to be managed for this use under Alternative 7-M. The snowmobile closure in the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness would be expanded on the north end to include Trapper Creek, an area that has become popular with backcountry skiers. This closure was expanded to protect moose winter range but would also ensure that both snowmobilers and skiers have opportunities in the Lionhead area. Designation of the Continental Divide Trail as a ski/snowshoe route south of Targhee Pass was considered in Alternatives 3, 4, and 6, but was not included under Alternative 7-M. This route would not provide a quality ski/snowshoe experience unless a snowmobile closure encompassing the surrounding area was also included. A snowmobile closure in this area would be difficult to enforce given the high level of snowmobile use occurring in the South

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Plateau TPA, and when the amount of additional higher-priority closures proposed elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District under Alternative 7-M are considered. The Continental Bowl area would be open to snowmobiles under Alternative 7-M, but this area receives little or no snowmobile use currently and is terrain-limited for snowmobiles. Additionally, a snowmobile closure in this area would be difficult to enforce when the amount of additional higher-priority closures proposed elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District under Alternative 7-M are considered.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Sheep Lake trail 218, connector 216, & Watkins Cr 215 are all important trails that allow travel through the Lionhead Mountain Range. This is an important and highly valued area and experience for motorcycle riders. Motorcycles were used in all area currently designated as wilderness prior to those area's designation in Montana.	Lionhead	The Mile Creek Trail #214, Watkins Creek Trail #215, West Fork Watkins Trail #216, Sheep Lake Trail #218, and Coffin Lakes Trail #209 would be closed to summer motorized use under Alternative 7-M to separate motorized and non-motorized users, and to improve grizzly bear core habitat (in the case of Trails #209, 215, and 216).
Sally Ferguson	Winter Wildland's Alliance	336	Idaho	Pat McKenna, of M. Q. R., has identified two excellent areas which offer a wide spectrum of opportunity for quiet winter recreation on the Hebgen Ranger District. Both areas are accessible and offer ideal terrain for beginning to intermediate ski touring and snowshoeing, as well as advanced backcountry skiing opportunities. These areas are the east side of Targhee Pass, the Continental Divide Trail, and the west side of Targhee, Continental Bowl.	Lionhead	Designation of the Continental Divide Trail as a ski/snowshoe route south of Targhee Pass was considered in Alternatives 3, 4, and 6, but was not included under Alternative 7-M. This route would not provide a quality ski/snowshoe experience unless a snowmobile closure encompassing the surrounding area was also included. A snowmobile closure in this area would be difficult to enforce given the high level of snowmobile use occurring in the South Plateau TPA, and when the amount of additional higher-priority closures proposed elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District under Alternative 7-M are considered. The Continental Bowl area would be open to snowmobiles under Alternative 7-M, but this area receives little or no snowmobile use currently and is terrain-limited for snowmobiles. Additionally, a snowmobile closure in this area would be difficult to enforce when the amount of additional higher-priority closures proposed elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District under Alternative 7-M are considered.
Sally Ferguson	Winter Wildland's Alliance	336		Alternative seven of the Gallatin Travel Plan Revision actually identifies the Continental Divide Trail as a ski trail; it does not show a shaded area on the map to indicate a restriction to snow machine use of the trail and area. At a recent planning	Lionhead	Designation of the Continental Divide Trail as a ski/snowshoe route south of Targhee Pass was considered in Alternatives 3, 4, and 6, but was not included under Alternative 7-M. This route would not provide a quality ski/snowshoe experience unless a

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				meeting in West Yellowstone, you acknowledged the suitability of this area for beginning and intermediate skiers. Also at the meeting, Pat brought to your attention that Continental Bowl is in an area that has been used by backcountry skiers for at least 25 years and currently sees little motorized activity.		snowmobile closure encompassing the surrounding area was also included. A snowmobile closure in this area would be difficult to enforce given the high level of snowmobile use occurring in the South Plateau TPA, and when the amount of additional higher-priority closures proposed elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District under Alternative 7-M are considered. The Continental Bowl area would be open to snowmobiles under Alternative 7-M, but this area receives little or no snowmobile use currently and is terrain-limited for snowmobiles. Additionally, a snowmobile closure in this area would be difficult to enforce when the amount of additional higher-priority closures proposed elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District under Alternative 7-M are considered.
Shane Roos		112	West Yellowstone	The Sheep Mountain/Lionshead backcountry was currently open and not being over used by lack of evidence of damages to environment or wildlife as proven by years of responsible users and no significant impact or damages evident. Off trail use by motorcycles and ATVs are evident but to restrict access would compromise access rights by off road or on-trail vehicle i.e. motorcycle/ATV use.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Sue Lang		1687		I have hiked Watkins Creek and Lionhead (215 & 217) and would request they be non-motorized in winter and summer. There are already many motorized trails in the area for those who enjoy that type of back wood travel.	Lionhead	Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. The Lionhead Mountain and Upper Watkins Creek area is a well-known and well-used destination for backcountry challenge snowmobile riding, and would continue to be

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						managed for this use under Alternative 7-M. The snowmobile closure in the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness would be expanded on the north end to include Trapper Creek, an area that has become popular with backcountry skiers. This closure was expanded to protect moose winter range but would also ensure that both snowmobilers and skiers have opportunities in the Lionhead area.
Tim Beardsley		1646	Ennis	Sheep Lake Trail #218 should be closed to all motorized vehicles and mountain bikes for safety reasons. This is a very narrow trail with numerous switch backs, it is very dangerous for people on horseback to pass motorized vehicles and mountain bikes whether they are moving or not.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS). Alternative 6 was modified to close the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness Area to mountain bikes, while Alternative 7-M would continue to allow mountain bikes on trails in this area, including those that connect with trails in the Targhee Creek drainage on the adjoining Targhee National Forest where mountain biking is also allowed. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas.
Todd Orr		840		114 - CDT Targhee pass - suggest managing as open to motorcycle use.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Todd Orr		840		215 - Watkins suggest managing as open to motorcycle use and a rewarding loop.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Todd Orr		840		217 - Watkins/CDT connection - Suggest managing as is open for motorized use and a rewarding loop.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
William and Peggy Moore		231	West Yellowstone	Moreover, it is not as if the ATVs and motorcycle have no other alternative to traverse the distance between the Lionhead Rd. and the town of West Yellowstone. There is a wide, cleared trail alongside Hwy 20 precisely for their use. It should continue to be the off-road set aside for ORV use because its	Lionhead	Consideration was given to restriction of summer motorized use on Forest Road #1720 in the Buttermilk and East Fork Denny Creek area under Alternatives 1-6, while ATV's and motorcycles would be allowed on this route under Alternative 7-M. The rationale for allowing ATV's and motorcycles on this route was to provide a

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				intrusion into wildlife habitat is minimal.		legal and safe route for ATV and motorcycle users to ride from West Yellowstone to the Lionhead trail system without riding in the Highway 20 right-of-way as they currently do. The current ATV and motorcycle use occurring in the Highway 20 right-of-way is a major safety issue due to the close proximity of high-speed traffic. We recognize that opening this route to ATV's and motorcycles would affect grizzly bear and big game use of this specific area. Habitat for grizzly bears is analyzed and managed on the larger Bear Management Subunit (BMS) scale due to the large spatial requirements of this species. The Buttermilk and East Fork Denny Creek area is within the Henry' Lake #2 BMS. Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear habitat values for the Henry's Lake #2 BMS through additional restrictions on motorized use elsewhere in the BMS (primarily in the Henry's Lake Mountains) and is consistent with the Conservation Strategy for Grizzly Bears in the Greater Yellowstone Area (see analysis for Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS). The analysis of big game habitat for the FEIS recognized that this area has open motorized route densities that exceed recommended levels for elk. However, public safety concerns outweighed the negative effects to wildlife of allowing ATV and motorcycle use on this route, especially when the wildlife habitat improvements that would result from motorized use restrictions elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District and Gallatin National Forest as proposed under Alternative 7-M are considered.
Alex Phillips		1483a		I support the removal of mountain bikes from the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness. Very few mountain bikes travel there now. Now is the time to do it. Later, during forest planning any ban of mountain bikes can be removed if that looks like the way to go, but to take it away once biking is more established there will be a huge problem for the agency.	Lionhead	Alternative 6 was modified to close the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness Area to mountain bikes, while Alternative 7-M would continue to allow mountain bikes on trails in this area, including those that connect with trails in the Targhee Creek drainage on the adjoining Targhee National Forest where mountain biking is also allowed. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's.
Don Pierry		1481		Snowmobiles and ATVs: Sheep Lake Trail #218 should be open to dirt bikes so you can fish in the evening after work.	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Joe Polus		1487		Sheep Lake trail 218, connector 216 and Watkins Creek 215 are all important trails that allow motorcycle travel through the Lionhead Mountain Range. This is an important and highly valued area and experience for motorcycle riders. Leaving these trails open in an area recommended for wilderness will not detract from the "wilderness character" in the event congress makes this area wilderness. Motorcycles were used in all areas currently designated as wilderness prior to those area's designation (in Montana).	Lionhead	Trails #114, 215, 216, and 218 would be open to motorcycle or ATV use under Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Lionhead TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources by separating the TPA into motorized and non-motorized emphasis areas for both winter and summer. During summer, the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness and Watkins Creek area would be managed for non-motorized uses while the area east of Lionhead Mountain would continue to emphasize motorized use, including ATV's. Besides separating motorized and non-motorized uses, Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS).
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We agree with the proposal for Republic Mountain. However, we strongly disagree with the provision in the preferred alternative for the Lionhead that establishes a snowmobile area within the RW.	Roadless, Wilderness, Recommended Wilderness	The entire Lionhead Recommended Wilderness Area would be closed to snowmobile use under Alternatives 1-5. Alternative 6 was modified to include an expanded snowmobile closure area on a more identifiable boundary in Upper Watkins Creek and encompassing the entire Recommended Wilderness Area. Under Alternative 7-M, snowmobiles would be managed the same except that the snowmobile closure boundary in the Watkins Creek area would be on the ridge dividing Watkins and Coffin Creeks, which is within the Recommended Wilderness. This would be a more

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						identifiable boundary to the public and would be easier to enforce.
Mike Slevin		224	West Yellowstone	In the Hebgen Lake ranger District we use the Forest in many ways snowmobiling, cross country skiing in the winter, firewood gathering, hunting, fishing, sight seeing by us and park visitors who wish to see backcountry around Yellowstone Park, to close totally or to restrict which groups can use which area will cause conflict and will be forced into the same area.	Roadless, Wilderness, Recommended Wilderness	Alternative 7-M manages travel on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources. To accomplish this goal, travel restrictions would be implemented during winter and/or summer in places to separate motorized and non-motorized uses. Additionally, travel restrictions would be implemented in some areas to protect Forest resources. Under all alternatives, the only area on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District closed to all human travel would be the approximately 75-acre closure on Horse Butte effective from 12/1-8/15 annually to protect nesting bald eagles.
Bob and Joanne Hitchcock		228	West Yellowstone	It has come to our attention you plan to open the Forest Service road behind our home in Lazy Acres to off road vehicles. Naturally we have many concerns about this plan. This area is pristine wildlife habitat that includes grizzly bears, black bears, moose, elk, deer, sandhill cranes, the great grey owl and many other birds. I am sure the noise and air pollution made by ORVs would have a disturbing effect.	South Plateau	Consideration was given to restriction of summer motorized use on Forest Road #1720 in the Buttermilk and East Fork Denny Creek area under Alternatives 1-6, while ATV's and motorcycles would be allowed on this route under Alternative 7-M. The rationale for allowing ATV's and motorcycles on this route was to provide a legal and safe route for ATV and motorcycle users to ride from West Yellowstone to the Lionhead trail system without riding in the Highway 20 right-of-way as they currently do. The current ATV and motorcycle use occurring in the Highway 20 right-of-way is a major safety issue due to the close proximity of high-speed traffic. This route would have to be brought up to standard before it could be opened for public use. We recognize that opening this route to ATV's and motorcycles would affect grizzly bear and big game use of this specific area. Habitat for grizzly bears is analyzed and managed on the larger Bear Management Subunit (BMS) scale due to the large spatial requirements of this species. The Buttermilk and East Fork Denny Creek area is within the Henry' Lake #2 BMS. Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear habitat values for the Henry's Lake #2 BMS through additional restrictions on motorized use elsewhere in the BMS (primarily in the Henry's Lake Mountains) and is consistent with the Conservation Strategy for Grizzly Bears in the Greater Yellowstone Area (see analysis for Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS). The analysis of big game habitat for the FEIS recognized that

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						this area has open motorized route densities that exceed recommended levels for elk. However, public safety concerns outweighed the negative effects to wildlife of allowing ATV and motorcycle use on this route, especially when the wildlife habitat improvements that would result from motorized use restrictions elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District and Gallatin National Forest as proposed under Alternative 7-M are considered. Both outfitted day-use horseback and outfitter/guide bird hunting are permitted in this area. However, there are numerous other horseback routes in the area and it is one of approximately 20 areas permitted bird hunting areas available on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District.
Bob Seibert		1040	Bozeman	YNP is experiencing extensive snowmobile trespass along its west boundary south of West Yellowstone. The FS could help control this problem by restricting all snowmobile travel east of the easterly most groomed snowmobile trails on the plateau.	South Plateau	With the exception of the snowmobile closure around the Rendezvous Ski Area, snowmobiles would be allowed up to the Yellowstone National Park (YNP) boundary in the South Plateau TPA under all alternatives. The YNP boundary is a clearly marked, easily defined feature in most places where snowmobilers may encounter it. Implementing a snowmobile closure between the YNP boundary and the South Plateau trail would not alleviate snowmobile trespass problems within YNP; it would only shift the boundary that needed to be enforced.
Bob Swinth		207	Bozeman	Close the South Plateau road # 1700 seg 1 between the town of West Yellowstone and the Rendezvous ski trails area to snowmobiles. Relocate the snowmobile route starting south from the end of Electric Street to where it can join road #1700 well past the Rendezvous ski trails area. This action would also reduce conflicts between Nordic skiers and snowmobilers by eliminating there intersection between them at the 1 kilometer point on the in/out trail and by moving snowmbilers away from Rendezvous Ski Trail area and thereby reducing their temptation to intrude on that area.	South Plateau	The Rendezvous Ski Trails would continue to be closed to snowmobile use under all alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the South Plateau snowmobile trail would be re-routed to leave West Yellowstone off Electric Street to avoid intersecting ski trails.
Bob Swinth		207	Bozeman	Completely close the Rendezvous Ski trails area to snowmobiles. This would reduce the conflicts between Nordic skiers and snowmobiles without scientifically affecting the terrain available for snowmobiling	South Plateau	The Rendezvous Ski Trails would continue to be closed to snowmobile use under all alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the South Plateau snowmobile trail would be re-routed to leave West Yellowstone off Electric Street to avoid intersecting ski trails.
Carl W. Philippi		310	Arizona	We have learned that the forest service has plans to open a section of the old logging road south of	South Plateau	Consideration was given to restriction of summer motorized use on Forest Road #1720 in the Buttermilk

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Highway 20 between Cream Creek and Alice's Restaurant to motorized vehicles. In the 1980s, this area was opened to vehicular travel and there were constant problems with soil erosion, vegetation damage, noise pollution, and adjacent property trespass and harm to the natural animal populations.		and East Fork Denny Creek area under Alternatives 1-6, while ATV's and motorcycles would be allowed on this route under Alternative 7-M. The rationale for allowing ATV's and motorcycles on this route was to provide a legal and safe route for ATV and motorcycle users to ride from West Yellowstone to the Lionhead trail system without riding in the Highway 20 right-of-way as they currently do. The current ATV and motorcycle use occurring in the Highway 20 right-of-way is a major safety issue due to the close proximity of high-speed traffic. This route would have to be brought up to standard before it could be opened for public use. We recognize that opening this route to ATV's and motorcycles would affect grizzly bear and big game use of this specific area. Habitat for grizzly bears is analyzed and managed on the larger Bear Management Subunit (BMS) scale due to the large spatial requirements of this species. The Buttermilk and East Fork Denny Creek area is within the Henry' Lake #2 BMS. Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear habitat values for the Henry's Lake #2 BMS through additional restrictions on motorized use elsewhere in the BMS (primarily in the Henry's Lake Mountains) and is consistent with the Conservation Strategy for Grizzly Bears in the Greater Yellowstone Area (see analysis for Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS). The analysis of big game habitat for the FEIS recognized that this area has open motorized route densities that exceed recommended levels for elk. However, public safety concerns outweighed the negative effects to wildlife of allowing ATV and motorcycle use on this route, especially when the wildlife habitat improvements that would result from motorized use restrictions elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District and Gallatin National Forest as proposed under Alternative 7-M are considered.
Carl W. Philippi		310		At the present time, there is a perfectly adequate solution to provide access to the Lionhead forest roads. Paralleling highway 20, a well-maintained trail exists from West Yellowstone to the west Denny Creek Road which provides the access to Lionshead area.	South Plateau	Consideration was given to restriction of summer motorized use on Forest Road #1720 in the Buttermilk and East Fork Denny Creek area under Alternatives 1-6, while ATV's and motorcycles would be allowed on this route under Alternative 7-M. The rationale for allowing ATV's and motorcycles on this route was to provide a legal and safe route for ATV and motorcycle users to ride from West Yellowstone to the Lionhead trail system

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						without riding in the Highway 20 right-of-way as they currently do. The current ATV and motorcycle use occurring in the Highway 20 right-of-way is a major safety issue due to the close proximity of high-speed traffic. This route would have to be brought up to standard before it could be opened for public use. We recognize that opening this route to ATV's and motorcycles would affect grizzly bear and big game use of this specific area. Habitat for grizzly bears is analyzed and managed on the larger Bear Management Subunit (BMS) scale due to the large spatial requirements of this species. The Buttermilk and East Fork Denny Creek area is within the Henry' Lake #2 BMS. Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear habitat values for the Henry's Lake #2 BMS through additional restrictions on motorized use elsewhere in the BMS (primarily in the Henry's Lake Mountains) and is consistent with the Conservation Strategy for Grizzly Bears in the Greater Yellowstone Area (see analysis for Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS). The analysis of big game habitat for the FEIS recognized that this area has open motorized route densities that exceed recommended levels for elk. However, public safety concerns outweighed the negative effects to wildlife of allowing ATV and motorcycle use on this route, especially when the wildlife habitat improvements that would result from motorized use restrictions elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District and Gallatin National Forest as proposed under Alternative 7-M are considered.
Loren Blanksma		1194		South Plateau: I object to closing any portion of the Continental Divide Trail because this is a good motorized trail for both motorcycles and ATVs that receives a lot of local use. Also, some of the road closures (1700, 1748, 1786) seem unwarranted in light of the fact that many roads in this area are already closed (1704 Mosquito Gulch Complex, 1710).	South Plateau	Under Alternative 7-M, the Continental Divide Trail would be relocated in 2 places that would be managed for non-motorized use to reflect the Forest Service Chief's direction for providing a non-motorized route on this trail. However, ATV and motorcycle use would be allowed on most of what is currently the Continental Divide Trail on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District, including the section along Buttermilk and East Fork of Denny Creeks that is currently closed to motorized use. Approximately 3 miles of trail from the junction with Trail #217 to the head of Watkins Creek would be managed for non-motorized use to separate motorized and non-motorized uses and improve grizzly bear core habitat in the Henry's Lake #2 BMS (see Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS). Forest Roads

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						#1748, 1700, and 1786 would be open to passenger vehicles under Alternatives 3-6. Under Alternative 7-M Forest Road #1700 would be open to passenger vehicles up to the intersection with Forest Road #1786, and beyond this location both roads would be managed for administrative or project use. Public motorized use would be ended at this location because it is an ideal place for a gate and would alleviate chronic illegal summer motorized vehicle problems on the Targhee National Forest. Additionally, the motorized recreational opportunities lost as a result of this would be minimal because the gate would be located several miles from the Idaho border, beyond which summer motorized vehicle use is not allowed. Forest Road #1748 is a dead-end route paralleling a main Forest access road (#1700) and provides little recreational opportunity.
Lynn Philippi		332	West Yellowstone	Safety: there is a huge potential for very serious traffic accidents with the adoption of alternative 7. Motor traffic crossing Highway 20 from Denny Creek Road to Forest Service road 1720 south of Targhee Rentals will be doing so at its most vulnerable point. Due to the extreme downgrade of Targhee Pass, trucks and RVs are traveling at a very high rate of speed with little chance of stopping to avoid serious collisions. Why would we put ATV users, vacationing families in RVs, truck drivers and area residents in unnecessary danger?	South Plateau	The U.S. 20 crossing for Forest Road #1720 would have >1,000' sight distance and would be consistent with Montana Department of Transportation highway approach requirements. Additionally, all motorized traffic crossing the highway at this location would be required to stop first.
Mike Slevin		224	West Yellowstone	Road 1791 reaches Road 1790 by way of the trail system as well as power line. I think that 1790 south of Hwy 20 should be open to ATV-Hikers through the Butter Milk at 1720.	South Plateau	Allowing ATV's on Forest Road #1790 would provide very little additional access to ATV users because both ends of this route link to other routes that would be open to this use under Alternative 7-M. Additionally, this area already has high open motorized route densities (see Big Game and Grizzly Bear Issues, FEIS) and the minimal increase in recreational opportunity created by allowing ATV's on this route would not offset the negative effects to wildlife habitat.
Mike Slevin		224	West Yellowstone	On 1735 in section 16 &17 there is a well established road trail that easily supports ATVs & motorcycles, it loops through these sections then joins up with (217 not shown) and back to 1735 this area provides great views of the South Fork meandering to Hebgen Lake a view you can not get just anywhere on the road and trail systems.	South Plateau	Forest Road #1735 would be managed for administrative use under Alternative 7-M. This area already has high open motorized route densities (see Big Game and Grizzly Bear Issues, FEIS) and the minimal increase in recreational opportunity created by allowing ATV's on this route would not offset the negative effects to wildlife habitat.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Pat and Bob Pierpoint		208		It is our understanding that the Forest Service plans to open up the old logging road, just west and across Denny Creek from us, to ATV traffic. We believe this would be a serious mistake. The area is not only peaceful and quiet for hikers, but it is also the home of many different wild animals and birds, including Bear, moose, elk, deer, sandhill cranes, and Canadian geese. The noise and pollution caused by the ATVs would certainly disrupt the lives of all of these creatures, not to mention our own.	South Plateau	Consideration was given to restriction of summer motorized use on Forest Road #1720 in the Buttermilk and East Fork Denny Creek area under Alternatives 1-6, while ATV's and motorcycles would be allowed on this route under Alternative 7-M. The rationale for allowing ATV's and motorcycles on this route was to provide a legal and safe route for ATV and motorcycle users to ride from West Yellowstone to the Lionhead trail system without riding in the Highway 20 right-of-way as they currently do. The current ATV and motorcycle use occurring in the Highway 20 right-of-way is a major safety issue due to the close proximity of high-speed traffic. This route would have to be brought up to standard before it could be opened for public use. We recognize that opening this route to ATV's and motorcycles would affect grizzly bear and big game use of this specific area. Habitat for grizzly bears is analyzed and managed on the larger Bear Management Subunit (BMS) scale due to the large spatial requirements of this species. The Buttermilk and East Fork Denny Creek area is within the Henry' Lake #2 BMS. Alternative 7-M improves grizzly bear habitat values for the Henry's Lake #2 BMS through additional restrictions on motorized use elsewhere in the BMS (primarily in the Henry's Lake Mountains) and is consistent with the Conservation Strategy for Grizzly Bears in the Greater Yellowstone Area (see analysis for Grizzly Bear Issue in FEIS). The analysis of big game habitat for the FEIS recognized that this area has open motorized route densities that exceed recommended levels for elk. However, public safety concerns outweighed the negative effects to wildlife of allowing ATV and motorcycle use on this route, especially when the wildlife habitat improvements that would result from motorized use restrictions elsewhere on the Hebgen Lake Ranger District and Gallatin National Forest as proposed under Alternative 7-M are considered.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438	Bozeman	You proposed adding a groomed snowmobile loop to the South Plateau Travel Planning Area near West Yellowstone. The addition of a new snowmobile loop will help disperse snowmobile traffic in the West Yellowstone area. State-owned grooming equipment may be used for maintaining this loop. This may	South Plateau	Alternative 7-M would create a new groomed snowmobile route on Forest Road #2671 in the South Plateau TPA.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				require a review of the categorical exclusion granted in 1996 under the Montana Snowmobile Grant program for the West Yellowstone groomed trail system and updated to note the addition of the new groomed snowmobile loop, pending the Forest's final decision notice.		
Peggy A. Lynn		342	West Yellowstone	I support Alt 7 because of the winter closure to snowmachine use around the Rendezvous trails, Hebgen Lake and Lionhead area. Specifically, rerouting the beginning of the South Plateau Snowmobile trail as an extension of Electric Street in the town of West Yellowstone.	South Plateau	The Rendezvous Ski Trails would continue to be closed to snowmobile use under all alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the South Plateau snowmobile trail would be re-routed to leave West Yellowstone off Electric Street to avoid intersecting ski trails. It would also implement a snowmobile closure along portions of the Madison Arm, Madison River, Duck/Cougar Creeks, and Black Sands Spring to protect winter wildlife habitat. The area south of Baker's Hole and between Highway 191 and the YNP boundary would also have a snowmobile closure to provide for a designated ski/snowshoe trail.
				Another trail destroyed by ATVs is the Two Top trail. During the hot summer the soil on this trail turns to a dusty powder sometimes many inches thick. That trail has literally become a race track. The South Plateau trail leaving West Yellowstone should be moved so that it does not cross the Rendezvous ski trails.	South Plateau	The Forest Service acknowledges that the Two Top Trail #116 often becomes very dusty during summer due to the soil type in this area. While this may affect visitor experience, it is not a resource damage issue. Soils in this area are relatively stable, is maintained to ATV standards, and it is capable of sustaining this type of use. Under Alternative 7-M, the South Plateau snowmobile trail would be re-routed to leave West Yellowstone off Electric Street to avoid intersecting ski trails.
Cassie Munson		125	Big Sky	Alternative 7 proposes opening the top portion of Pika Point to ATVs. This would be detrimental to the terrain. It is above tree line and would be destroyed. There would be nothing to obstruct ATVs from going anywhere.	Taylor Fork	ATV's would be allowed on the Oil Well Road Trail #68 up to its junction with Trail #203, and on Trail #203 from this junction to Pika Point. This was to provide a high-quality recreational opportunity for ATV users in a larger area where such opportunities were substantially reduced relative to the current condition. Pika Point was selected as the end point for ATV use on this trail because it is a definable landscape feature and the trail north of this point is not conducive to ATV use due to vegetation and trail condition. The Oil Well Road Trail #68 and a portion of Trail #203 are trails where ATV use is consistent with the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area (see Roadless Issue in FEIS). Through adequate signing along with continued monitoring and enforcement,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						compliance with travel restrictions in this area would be acceptable. The Forest Service would continue to have the discretion to make travel changes addressing site-specific resource concerns as they arise.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 8 and 10 - Buck Creek - Motorized - Summer and winter - Leave open - This area is a great place to take the family to ride, viewing the mountains, wildlife summer and winter.	Taylor Fork	Trail #10 would be open to summer and winter motorized use under Alternative 7-M. Alternative 7-M would provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes on Trail #8. North of Lizard Lakes, Trail #8 is located partially within the Lee Metcalf Wilderness Area and was therefore not designated for motorized use beyond this point. The area around Trail #8 would be closed to snowmobile use to protect big game winter range.
Don Pierry		1481		Snowmobiles and ATVs: A connecting trail up Cache Creek to Buck Creek should be open to connect travel from West Yellowstone to Big Sky.	Taylor Fork	Alternative 7-M, would provide for a connector from Taylor Fork to the Big Sky area via the Buck Creek Road #136 rather than the Meadow Creek Cutoff Trail #223, Albino Lake Trail #33, Marble Mountain Trail #168, or Inspiration Divide Trail #8. The Buck Creek Road would be the connector route because it would allow the motorcycle connection to occur while providing for improvements in grizzly bear core habitat. Motorcycle use on Road #136 would not affect grizzly bear core habitat because motorized use would otherwise be allowed for administrative purposes. A snowmobile connector from the Taylor Fork to Big Sky was considered in Alternative 3 but was not incorporated into Alternative 7-M due to the negative effects it would have on wintering big game.
Eva Patten	BWAGs	468	Gallatin Gateway	We discussed the rerouting of the snowmobile trail from Sage Creek to the Oil Well Road. We question this proposal for several reasons. It is steep and tricky enough to discourage all but the most proficient snowmobilers. It will be costly to improve a trail there. People will undoubtedly continue to use the Taylor Fork/Wapiti access they are accustomed to. Snowmobilers are also allowed on trail #71. This presently invites users to continue up trail #11 to play in the backcountry which is off limits for snowmobilers. This whole situation needs rethinking before the final EIS is issued.	Taylor Fork	A safe snowmobile route from the Sage Creek Trailhead is feasible. The benefits of re-routing the trail from Wapiti to Trail #71, including improved public access and safety along with reduced impacts to wintering wildlife, would outweigh the financial costs of constructing the new trail. Alternative 7-M would greatly diminish the potential for snowmobile use on the Taylor Fork Road because the Wapiti Road would be closed to snowmobile use thus precluding a loop route on the Taylor Fork Road back to the Sage Creek Trailhead. The snowmobile closure boundary at Sage Creek would be definable to the public and thus enforceable.
Jack T. Roberson		686	Bozeman	I believe ATVs should continue to be allowed to use trail 68 from trail 203 to trail 206 and trail 206 from its junction with trail 68 to Gully Creek. The present	Taylor Fork	ATV use on this trail segment was considered under Alternative 1-4, but would not be allowed under Alternative 7-M because the legislation establishing the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				travel plan shows these trails closed from Oct. 30 - July 15. I proposed this be changed to Sept. 15 - July 15 on the Preferred Alternative 7. This would curtail trail damage during hunting season when the fall rains and snow arrive. Another added benefit would be wildlife security. Also, trail 206 from its junction with trail 68 to the Lee-Metcalf Wilderness boundary should be, or remain, closed to ATV and trail bike use. Again, wildlife security and less erosion.		Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area only provides for motorized uses that were established prior to 1983 when the Lee Metcalf Wilderness Act was enacted (see Roadless Issue, FEIS). ATV's or other 4-wheeled vehicles were not an established use of this trail segment in 1983 and are therefore not consistent with the Act. ATV's would be allowed on the Oil Well Road Trail #68 up to its junction with Trail #203, and on Trail #203 from this junction to Pika Point. This was to provide a high-quality recreational opportunity for ATV users in a larger area where such opportunities were substantially reduced relative to the current condition. Pika Point was selected as the end point for ATV use on this trail because it is a definable landscape feature and the trail north of this point is not conducive to ATV use due to vegetation and trail condition. The Oil Well Road Trail #68 and a portion of Trail #203 are trails where ATV use is consistent with the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management (see Roadless Issue in FEIS).
Jack T. Roberson		686		If the FS is truly interested in wildlife security and less erosion, then completely close trail 74 from trail 35 to trail 68 (Little Wapiti area). Having trail 74 open, even from trail bikes only, is unnecessary redundancy when trail 74 parallels trail 68 within 1 to 1 1/2 miles. Someone probably thought this would avoid "conflicts" with other users. At only about 5 miles long, trail 74 is more hilly with more gullies and therefore more prone to damage and erosion by speeding rail bikes with large knobby tires. More wildlife hangs around Little Wapiti Creek (trail 74) and adjoining meadows and feeder creeks than around trail 68 in this area. Trail 68 is more than adequate to handle all users.	Taylor Fork	Little Wapiti Trail #74 would be managed for non-motorized use under Alternative 7-M. Trails #68 and 203 would provide motorized access in this area.
Jed Statz		1044	Bozeman	Do not move the Wapiti Trail to Sage Creek in Taylor Fork area for snowmobiles. I have ridden by moose one on my snowmobile as they have not reacted. This relocation of trailheads for snowmobile use is unjustified.	Taylor Fork	A safe snowmobile route from the Sage Creek Trailhead is feasible. The benefits of re-routing the trail from Wapiti to Trail #71 include improved public access and safety along with reduced impacts to wintering wildlife. This proposal was strongly endorsed by Montana Fish, Wildlife, & Parks as providing important protection for wintering wildlife.
Joe Polus		1487		Keep Buck Creek Trail #174 open because it is so seldom used there will be virtually no impact by	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				leaving it open.		Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector route from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Joe Polus		1487		Trail #168 (Marble Mountain) and Trails #33, & 233 connect Cinnamon to Taylor's Fork - These connections are very important to motorcycle riders to provide high quality looping experiences. Please leave open.	Taylor Fork	Alternative 7-M, would provide for a connector from Taylor Fork to the Buck/Cinnamon area via the Buck Creek Road #136 rather than the Meadow Creek Cutoff Trail #223, Albino Lake Trail #33, or Marble Mountain Trail #168. The Buck Creek Road would be the connector route because it would allow the motorcycle connection to occur while providing for improvements in grizzly bear core habitat. Motorcycle use on Road #136 would not affect grizzly bear core habitat because motorized use would otherwise be allowed for administrative purposes. Managing Trail #223 for non-motorized use would improve grizzly bear core habitat.
Joe Polus		1487		Cinnamon trails 6 and 30 - Please more opening and closing dates to June 1st and October 15th respectively.	Taylor Fork	Trails #6 and 30 would be open to motorcycle from June 15-September 15. June 15 would be used because to limit disturbance to spring/early summer big game and grizzly bear habitat and to protect trails from damage. September 15 was used to limit displacement of grizzly bears from important fall foraging habitat and to reduce user conflicts during hunting season.
Joe Polus		1487		Cache Creek Area - Please leave open - there are many meadows and trails/roads in this area that are highly enjoyable to snowmobile users. Buffer zones should not be allowable management tool for forest rangers, especially in areas with no history of wilderness intrusions.	Taylor Fork	The Cache Creek area would be closed to snowmobile use under Alternative 7-M to protect wintering elk and moose. The Eldridge Creek area which was depicted as closed to snowmobile use under Alternative 7 of the DEIS, would be open to snowmobile use under Alternative 7-M. Upon further evaluation, the winter range protection benefits of a snowmobile closure in this area were determined to be minimal. This proposal was strongly endorsed by Montana Fish, Wildlife, & Parks in their input to the Travel Plan DEIS.
Joe Polus		1487		Sage Creek access to Carrot Basin - This proposed access would be an excellent additional access to the Carrot Basin Area.	Taylor Fork	Under Alternative 7-M, the Sage Creek trailhead would become the main snowmobile access route to Carrot Basin. However, the Lower Wapiti area would be closed

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						to snowmobile use to protect important big game winter range, particularly for moose. This proposal was strongly endorsed by Montana Fish, Wildlife, & Parks and would improve public safety, be feasible to groom, and provide important protection for wintering wildlife.
John and Joan Underwood		1140	Bozeman	The presently used ATV/Motorcycle trail beginning in Taylor Fork just off Wapiti Creek and generally following the Sage Creek/Wapiti Creek divide and ending at the Teepee Creek road (US 191) is planned for ATV closure for roughly the southern half of the trail. Why? Several years ago, plastic culverts were installed to prevent damage to water courses where the trail crosses them in upper Sage and Carrot basins. This trail is eminently suitable for continued ATV use and is in good condition.	Taylor Fork	ATV use on the Oil Well Road Trail #68 from the junction with Trail #203 to the intersection with Trail #151 in Cabin Creek was considered under Alternatives 1-4, but would not be allowed under Alternative 7-M because the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area only provides for motorized uses that were established prior to 1983 when the Lee Metcalf Wilderness Act was enacted (see Roadless Issue, FEIS). ATV's or other 4-wheeled vehicles were not an established use of this trail segment in 1983 and are therefore not consistent with the Act. ATV's would be allowed on the Oil Well Road Trail #68 up to its junction with Trail #203, and on Trail #203 from this junction to Pika Point. This was to provide a high-quality recreational opportunity for ATV users in a larger area where such opportunities were substantially reduced relative to the current condition. Pika Point was selected as the end point for ATV use on this trail because it is a definable landscape feature and the trail north of this point is not conducive to ATV use due to vegetation and trail condition. The Oil Well Road Trail #68 and a portion of Trail #203 are trails where ATV use is consistent with the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management (see Roadless Issue in FEIS).
Kerry White		1616		Cinnamon Creek Trail 168 to 33 into Taylors Fork and back up Taylors Fork to 223 and back on 33 to 6 would also be a good motorized loop trail. The county identifies 168, 33, 223, 30, 63, 73, 6, 8, 174, and 10 as motorized trails. If we could use trail 1 out of Buffalo Horn and jump up Cinnamon onto 168 over to Taylors Fork to complete the Big Sky Trail or this portion we would avoid Taylors Fork Road and fights with the Nine Quarter Circle over Plowing the road and snowmobiles on a plowed road. Trail 6 crosses private land and so does 223 into Taylors Fork. Do we have easements for these trails?	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat. Under Alternative 7-M, ATV's would be allowed on the Oil Well Road Trail #68

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						to its junction with Trail #203, and on Trail #203 from this junction to Pika Point. This was to provide a high-quality recreational opportunity for ATV users in a larger area where such opportunities were substantially reduced relative to the current condition. Pika Point was selected as the end point for ATV use on this trail because it is a definable landscape feature and the trail north of this point is not conducive to ATV use due to vegetation and trail condition. The Oil Well Road Trail #68 and a portion of Trail #203 are trails where ATV use is consistent with the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area (see Roadless Issue in FEIS). Under Alternative 7-M, re-routing the snowmobile trailhead to Sage Creek would alleviate the need for snowmobiles to use the Taylor Fork Road. Re-routing the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail to the Marble Mountain/Meadow Creek was not considered due to conflicts with important elk winter range in this area. Trail #223 is currently entirely on Forest Service lands and no easement is needed. The motorcycle route from Cinnamon to Buck Ridge avoids the portion of Trail #6 that crosses private lands.
Kerry White		1616		Taylors Fork and Carrot Basin are very popular for summer and winter use for motorized. A good loop trail would be 68 to 203 to 206 to 35 or 172. Also trail 11 going through the Monument area needs maintenance and would benefit every one if a month or so of motorized use every year could be achieved.	Taylor Fork	Trails #68, 203, and 206 in the Taylor Fork TPA would be designated for motorcycle use under Alternative 7-M. Trails 35 and 172 would be managed for summer non-motorized to provide for this type of recreational opportunity along with grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat. Snowmobile use would continue to be emphasized during winter in Carrot Basin. The upper portion of Sage Creek Trail #11 is within the Lee Metcalf Wilderness and was therefore not designated for motorized use.
Kerry White		1616		Trail 11 is adopted by the county and specifies motorized use. It only skirts the wilderness and I don't believe motorized would do any harm to the area. Trails 176, 151, and 52 are all non-motorized in this Monument area. Trail 11 would not conflict with any of these trails. Trail 70 does intersect 11 but we should promote 176, 151, and 52 for hikers that don't with to see or hear any motorized users. The county identifies trails 191, 11, 71, 68, 203, 206, 35, and 172 as being open to motorized in the Taylors Fork area.	Taylor Fork	The Forest Service has complete jurisdiction and management responsibility for all National Forest System trails. The Forest Service has no information or evidence indicating that Gallatin County has adopted Trail #11 or any other Gallatin National Forest trail. The upper portion of Sage Creek Trail #11 is within the Lee Metcalf Wilderness and was therefore not designated for motorized use.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Dead Horse Creek Road 136 Segment 2: this trail is very important to connect to trail 30 and trail 6 in the Cinnamon Creek area. Leaving this trail the road open will disperse use for motorcycles away from the popular stock use areas around Nine Quarter Circle Ranch.	Taylor Fork	Alternative 7-M, would provide for a connector from Taylor Fork to the Buck/Cinnamon area via the Buck Creek Road #136 rather than the Meadow Creek Cutoff Trail #223, Albino Lake Trail #33, or Marble Mountain Trail #168. The Buck Creek Road would be the connector route because it would allow the motorcycle connection to occur while providing for improvements in grizzly bear core habitat. Motorcycle use on Road #136 would not affect grizzly bear core habitat because motorized use would otherwise be allowed for administrative purposes. Managing Trail #223 for non-motorized use would improve grizzly bear core habitat.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Sage Creek Trail 11: the first mile of this trail must remain open to singletrack motorized use to allow access to Slide Creek Trail 71. Almost all resource damage in this section is from heavy stock use from nearby dude ranches. To stop trail damage, stock use should be restricted not motorcycle use.	Taylor Fork	Motorcycle use would be prohibited on Trail #71 under Alternative 7-M in part to reduce traffic levels and reduce user conflicts. The Forest Service recognizes that resource damage from horse use related to dude ranches on Trail #71 has occurred. However, these issues will be addressed through administration of their Special Use Permits and are therefore outside the scope of the Travel Plan decision.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Marble Mountain Trail 168: this trail sees very little motorcycle use so damage possibilities are minimal. 168 also provides an exceptional looping opportunity for motorcycles.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector route from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Meadow Creek Cut off Trail 223: even though this trail starts across from the Nine Quarter Circle Ranch it should be available for motorcycles as the motorized use damage is far less than stock use.	Taylor Fork	Alternative 7-M, would provide for a connector from Taylor Fork to the Buck/Cinnamon area via the Buck Creek Road #136 rather than the Meadow Creek Cutoff Trail #223, Albino Lake Trail #33, or Marble Mountain Trail #168. The Buck Creek Road would be the connector route because it would allow the motorcycle connection to occur while providing for improvements in grizzly bear core habitat. Motorcycle use on Road #136 would not affect grizzly bear core habitat because motorized use would otherwise be allowed for

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						administrative purposes. Managing Trail #223 for non-motorized use would improve grizzly bear core habitat.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Albino Lake Trail 33 Segment One: this is another trail from Taylor Fork road that has significant importance to connect to the Cinnamon Creek Trail area. By closing all these feeder trails to Taylor Fork from Cinnamon (33, 223, 136) the Forest Service has essentially cut off all connections between the two areas.	Taylor Fork	Alternative 7-M, would provide for a connector from Taylor Fork to the Buck/Cinnamon area via the Buck Creek Road #136 rather than the Meadow Creek Cutoff Trail #223, Albino Lake Trail #33, or Marble Mountain Trail #168. The Buck Creek Road would be the connector route because it would allow the motorcycle connection to occur while providing for improvements in grizzly bear core habitat. Motorcycle use on Road #136 would not affect grizzly bear core habitat because motorized use would otherwise be allowed for administrative purposes. Managing Trail #223 for non-motorized use would improve grizzly bear core habitat.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Big Sky Snowmobile Trail Re-Route -New-: this reroute is a bad idea. In many years there is not enough snow to ride from the Sage Creek parking lot at 191 to the upper meadows in Carrot Basin. Grooming would be impossible most of the year. Leave access as is.	Taylor Fork	Under Alternative 7-M, the Sage Creek trailhead would become the main snowmobile access route to Carrot Basin. The Lower Wapiti area would be closed to snowmobile use to protect important big game winter range, particularly for moose. This proposal was strongly endorsed by Montana Fish, Wildlife, & Parks for improving public safety, being easier to groom, and providing important protection for wintering wildlife.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Slide Creek Trail 71: this trail provides an excellent access from Highway 191 to the Carrot Basin area for motorcycles. All heavy damage has occurred from dude ranch stock use. Some of the worst damage in the Gallatin Forest (Todd Orr's Summary).	Taylor Fork	Motorcycle use would be prohibited on Trail #71 under Alternative 7-M in part to reduce traffic levels and reduce user conflicts. The Forest Service recognizes that resource damage from horse use related to dude ranches on Trail #71 has occurred. However, these issues will be addressed through administration of their Special Use Permits and are therefore outside the scope of the Travel Plan decision.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Cache Creek Fork Road 135, Dead Horse Creek Road 136 Segment One and Two: this area is an exceptional zone for family oriented snowmobile riding as it is very easy to moderate terrain. Lots of open valleys and parks. Virtually no conflicts of use as no other users come to this area. Rationale for this closure is totally flawed and unwarranted.	Taylor Fork	The Cache and Deadhorse Creek area would be closed to snowmobile use under Alternative 7-M to protect wintering elk and moose. The Eldridge Creek area which was depicted as closed to snowmobile use under Alternative 7 of the DEIS, would be open to snowmobile use under Alternative 7-M. Upon further evaluation, the winter range protection benefits of a snowmobile closure in this area were determined to be minimal. This proposal was strongly endorsed by Montana Fish, Wildlife, & Parks in their input to the Travel Plan DEIS.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Wapiti Trail 35: by taking all these little feeder trails that connect larger areas, you are creating large sections of unnecessary non-motorized wilderness	Taylor Fork	Trails 68, 74, 203, 35, and 172 in the Taylor Fork TPA are largely parallel routes that all lead to the same general area. Under Alternative 7-M, 2 of these routes

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				areas.		(203 and 68) would be managed for motorized use and 3 would be managed for non-motorized use to separate user groups and provide for wildlife habitat (especially grizzly bear core habitat).
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Cinnamon Buck Trail 6: this trail is an excellent connector from Buck Ridge (a popular snowmobile area from Doe Creek) to Taylor Fork. This area is mostly clear-cut areas very suitable for snowmobile use. This would make an excellent snowmobile route to connect Buck Ridge to Carrot Basin with little or no conflict of use or resource damage.	Taylor Fork	A snowmobile connector from the Taylor Fork to Big Sky via Trail #6 was considered in Alternative 3 but was not incorporated into Alternative 7-M due to the negative effects it would have on wintering big game.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Meadow Creek trail # 33 through section 1 needs to be open to motorcycle use from Taylor Fork to Albino Lake and on up to Buck Ridge. This will provide the only trail access to the North from Taylor Fork.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector route from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Cinnamon Mtn. trail # 73 to the Lookout need to be open to motorcycles. It's a nice ride and a good view. There is no valid reason for motorcycles to not use it.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector route from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Middle Basin trail #68 should be open to motorcycle use. It completes a loop.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector route from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Reopen Inspiration trail # 8 from Lizard Lake to Flat Top Mtn. This is a fun ride with views and completes a loop. I really miss this one.	Taylor Fork	Alternative 7-M would provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes on Trail #8 and a connector to the Flattop Mountain area via Trail #6. Trail #8 is located partially within the Lee Metcalf Wilderness Area north of Lizard Lakes and was therefore not designated for motorcycle use beyond this point.
Linda Ellison		1070		Meadow Creek Cutoff Trail #223 is an essential link to Cinnamon/Buck creek where camping areas are limited.	Taylor Fork	Alternative 7-M, would provide for a connector from Taylor Fork to the Buck/Cinnamon area via the Buck Creek Road #136 rather than the Meadow Creek Cutoff Trail #223. The Buck Creek Road would be the connector route because it would allow the motorcycle connection to occur while providing for improvements in grizzly bear core habitat. Motorcycle use on Road #136 would not affect grizzly bear core habitat because motorized use would otherwise be allowed for administrative purposes. Managing Trail #223 would for non-motorized use would improve grizzly bear core habitat.
Linda G. Miller		1	West Yellowstone	This letter is to reiterate our concerns for safety with the increasing use of mountain bikes on trail 71. Last fall we talked about the possibilities - including asking bikes to only go uphill. At the very least both the bikers and the riders need to be warned at both ends that there are horseback riders and bikes sharing some rough terrain on this trail.	Taylor Fork	Mountain bikes would be allowed on Trail #71 under Alternative 7-M . The Forest Service has used signs and provided trail etiquette information at bike shops in recent years to warn mountain bikers of the potential for conflict with stock users on this trail, and would continue to do so under Alternative 7-M. Motorcycle use would be prohibited on this trail under Alternative 7-M in part to reduce traffic levels and reduce user conflicts.
Linda Miller	Elkhorn Ranch	1433		We support closing trail # 11 to bicycles and motorized use in managing the trail for horseback riding.	Taylor Fork	Sage Creek Trail #11 would be closed to both mountain bikes and motorized vehicles under Alternatives 2 through 7-M.
Linda Miller	Elkhorn Ranch	1433	Gallatin Gateway	Trail 71 is not suitable for bicycles and horseback riders. This is a narrow, steep piece of trail that is used not only by the surrounding dude ranches but by the public leading from the Sage Creek trailhead. The Hebgen District did put up caution signs however in the interests of everyone's safety we would ask to close the trail to bikes or at least make	Taylor Fork	Mountain bikes would be allowed on Trail #71 under Alternative 7-M . The Forest Service has used signs and provided trail etiquette information at bike shops in recent years to warn mountain bikers of the potential for conflict with stock users on this trail, and would continue to do so under Alternative 7-M. Motorcycle use would be prohibited on this trail under Alternative 7-M in part to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				it one way to them (up hill is what we discussed it with the District because of the speed and concentration of the bikers coming downhill and the concern about collisions). Needless to say, for many of the same reasons, we would also like to see # 71 closed to motorcycles.		reduce traffic levels and reduce user conflicts.
Linda Miller	Elkhorn Ranch	1433		The Upper Gallatin Residents recommend closing the # 68 - #74 loop to bicycles. This is not prime bicycle riding country and seems inappropriate for continued bicycle use.	Taylor Fork	Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Taylor Fork TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources. Trail #68 is maintained to ATV standards and could easily continue to accommodate mountain bike use. Trail #74 is maintained at a lower standard and would provide a challenging ride that would be attractive to more skilled riders. The Forest Service is unaware of any resource or safety issue that would warrant consideration of closing this loop to mountain bikes, and it would continue to be open to mountain bikes under Alternative 7-M.
Linda Miller	Elkhorn Ranch	1433		The Deadhorse Creek Road #136 segment one is not a place for a road improved to passenger car standards. It is a prime wildlife area that will end up with heavy day traffic and probably camping. It should be closed all year around as proposed in alternatives 1, 2, 5, and 6	Taylor Fork	Passenger vehicles would be allowed on segment 1 of the Buck Creek Road because the high quality recreational opportunity provided would outweigh the negative effects to wildlife (which would be partially mitigated by implementing a July15-September 15 season of use).
Loren Blanksma		36	Bozeman	Trail #23 to Cinnamon Overlook is good destination trail. Trails #174, 223, or #33 are good connector trails between cinnamon and Taylor's Fork.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Loren Blanksma		1194		There are some motorcycle closures in the preferred alternative that do not make sense. First, to close all the connecting trails between Taylor's Fork and Cinnamon Creek does not seem to comply with the stated objective of supplying loop trail opportunities.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Loren Blanksma		1194		Marble Mountain Trail (168) is lightly used and in some places it is hard to even tell where it is at all. Consequently to close that trail to all use would seem inconsequential.	Taylor Fork	Marble Mountain Trail #168 would be managed for non-motorized use under Alternative 7-M and would continue to provide opportunities for hikers, stock users, and mountain bikes seeking a more challenging route with light use. This trail would likely continue to be a low priority for maintenance.
Loren Blanksma		1194		Meadow Creek Cutoff Trail (223) and alternately Albino Lake Trail (33) should remain open to motorcycles to provide a connector trail route from Cinnamon Creek to Taylor's Fork.	Taylor Fork	Alternative 7-M, would provide for a connector from Taylor Fork to the Buck/Cinnamon area via the Buck Creek Road #136 rather than the Meadow Creek Cutoff Trail #223. The Buck Creek Road would be the connector route because it would allow the motorcycle connection to occur while providing for improvements in grizzly bear core habitat. Motorcycle use on Road #136 would not affect grizzly bear core habitat because motorized use would otherwise be allowed for administrative purposes. Managing Trail #223 would for non-motorized use would improve grizzly bear core habitat.
Loren Blanksma		1194		There should also exist a motorcycle connector trail between Cinnamon Creek and Buck Creek Ridge. Currently the Cinnamon Buck trail (3) shows a connecting route, but that trail disappears and does not really provide a loop between Cinnamon Creek and Buck Creek Ridge. I would suggest that Inspiration Divide Trail (8) from Lizard Lakes to McAtee Basin be opened to motorcycles to provide this connector route between Cinnamon Creek and Buck Creek Ridge. However, since this route (8) would meet with great resistance because it follows the wilderness boundary, an alternative route on Blow Out trail (174) could be designated as a motorcycle connector route between Cinnamon Creek and Buck Creek Ridge.	Taylor Fork	Alternative 7-M would provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes on Trail #8 and a connector to Buck Ridge via Cinnamon Buck Trail #6. Trail #8 is located partially within the Lee Metcalf Wilderness Area north of Lizard Lakes and was therefore not designated for motorcycle use beyond this point. Trail work would be necessary to improve the viability of this route to many motorcyclists, but that would not affect the ability of this route to be designated as the connector from Taylor Fork-Cinnamon to Buck Ridge.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The Cinnamon Outlook Trail (73) should remain open to motorcycles as a good destination single track trail. I have no objection to closing the part of	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Cabin Creek Divide trail (206) from Lookout Point to the wilderness boundary, if the previously mentioned connector trails are established. Although I disagree with closing Slide Creek Trail (71) to motorcycles, I support the preferred alternative plans to leave the following trails open to motorcycle use: Cinnamon Buck trail (6), Cinnamon Lookout trail (73), Dead Horse Trail (63), Little Wapiti (74), Oil Well Road Trail (68), Minnie Wapiti Trail (203 from junction of trail 206 to Pika point), and Cabin Creek Divide Trail (206 to Lookout Point).		routes would provide for a connector from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Loren Blanksma		1194		In addition, the road complex (3100) in western Taylor's Fork is closed to motorized. This leaves the entire southwestern portion of Taylor's Fork as non-motorized which should be more than sufficient to comply with FS goals for this area.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		A group modification under the draft travel plan is recommended for the Taylor Fort Travel Planning Area. The groomed snowmobile trail is currently located at Wapiti Trailhead and is part of the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail. The proposed new groomed snowmobile trailhead is Sage Creek Trailhead. Relocating the trailhead will resolve a number of safety issues and continue to provide access to the Big Sky Trail. Historically, transportation of state owned equipment into and out from the Wapiti Trailhead has proved to be at times hazardous to the operator and the general public. The modification will also eliminate or reduce the use the county road by snowmobilers into Wapiti Trailhead. The Sage Creek Trailhead is the preferred area for staging grooming equipment.	Taylor Fork	Access to the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail would be located at the Sage Creek Trailhead under Alternative 7-M.
Paul D. Herbel		1330		174, 73, 33, 174, 68, 203, dates are inconsistent. This whole area is interlinked, rarely sees hikers and needs to stay open as long as possible.	Taylor Fork	The Forest Service acknowledges that seasonal restriction dates within the DEIS were inconsistent in this area. These dates were evaluated and changed in

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Alternative 7-M to the extent that the inconsistencies were unintentional.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Trail #71 has a high amount of horse damage (see Todd Orr's inventory) - please leave open so motorcycle use can help diminish the damage caused by horses.	Taylor Fork	Motorcycle use would be prohibited on Trail #71 under Alternative 7-M to reduce traffic levels and user conflicts. The Forest Service recognizes that resource damage from horse use related to dude ranches on Trail #71 has occurred. However, these issues will be addressed through administration of their Special Use Permits and are therefore outside the scope of the Travel Plan decision.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Trail E168 (Marble Mtn.) and Trail # 33 and 223 connect Cinnamon to Taylor's Fork - These connections are very important to M/C riders to provide high quality looping experiences. Please leave open.	Taylor Fork	Alternative 7-M, would provide for a connector from Taylor Fork to the Buck/Cinnamon area via the Buck Creek Road #136 rather than the Meadow Creek Cutoff Trail #223, Albino Lake Trail #33, or Marble Mountain Trail #168. The Buck Creek Road would be the connector route because it would allow the motorcycle connection to occur while providing for improvements in grizzly bear core habitat. Motorcycle use on Road #136 would not affect grizzly bear core habitat because motorized use would otherwise be allowed for administrative purposes. Managing Trail #223 for non-motorized use would improve grizzly bear core habitat.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Cache Creek Area - there are many meadows and trails/roads in this area that are highly enjoyable to snowmobile users. Buffer zones should not be an allowable management tool for forest rangers especially in areas with no history of wilderness intrusions.	Taylor Fork	The Cache Creek area would be closed to snowmobile use under Alternative 7-M to protect wintering elk and moose. The Eldridge Creek area which was depicted as closed to snowmobile use under Alternative 7 of the DEIS, would be open to snowmobile use under Alternative 7-M. Upon further evaluation, the winter range protection benefits of a snowmobile closure in this area were determined to be minimal. This proposal was strongly endorsed by Montana Fish, Wildlife, & Parks in their input to the Travel Plan DEIS.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Sage Creek access to Carrot Basin Area - This proposed access would be an excellent additional access to the Carrot Basin Area. Bill stated that the original Taylors Fork access would remain open after the new Cache Creek access is built. This is very important for access to this area during low snow conditions.	Taylor Fork	The Sage Creek trailhead was displayed in Alternative 7 of the DEIS, as the main snowmobile access route to Carrot Basin with the lower Oil Well Road and Wapiti Creek Road open (but not designated) to snowmobiles. Under Alternative 7-M, Sage Creek Trailhead would become the main access point but the Lower Wapiti area would be closed to snowmobile use to protect important big game winter range, particularly for moose. This alternative was generated following discussions with Montana Fish, Wildlife, & Parks staff regarding their input to the Travel Plan DEIS, and would improve public

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						safety, be feasible to groom, and provide important protection for wintering wildlife.
Shelly Watters and Steve Malmberg		1602		The Taylor Fork and Buck Ridge areas are valued by many for their spectacular scenery and wildlife. Motorized activity has been responsible for damaging these areas and preventing many of us from enjoying trails where motorized users are encountered.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing non-motorized and motorized use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Alternative 7-M manages travel in the Taylor Fork TPA to contribute towards the Forest-wide goal of providing a variety of recreational opportunities that allow for enjoyment of the Forest's resources. To accomplish this goal, travel restrictions would be implemented during winter and/or summer in places to separate motorized and non-motorized uses and protect various Forest resources. This would result in high quality experiences being available to all user groups. Under Alternative 7-M, summer motorized use recreational opportunities would be reduced relative to the current condition, and non-motorized opportunities would increase.
Todd Orr		840		172 - Eldridge - Sign and manage as is for non-motorized use. Sign to warn horse users to stay on the trail.	Taylor Fork	Trail #172 would continue to be managed for non-motorized use under Alternative 7-M. Resource damage from horse use related to dude ranches will be addressed through administration of Outfitter/Guide Special Use Permits and are therefore outside the scope of the Travel Plan decision.
Todd Orr		840		71 - Sage Ridge - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use. Suggest posting signs in areas with horse damage reminding stock riders to stay on developed route to reduce vegetative damage and soil compaction.	Taylor Fork	Mountain bikes would be allowed on Trail #71 under Alternative 7-M . The Forest Service has used signs and provided trail etiquette information at bike shops in recent years to warn mountain bikers of the potential for conflict with stock users on this trail, and would continue to do so under Alternative 7-M. Motorcycle use would be prohibited on this trail under Alternative 7-M in part to reduce traffic levels and reduce user conflicts. The Forest Service recognizes that resource damage from horse use related to dude ranches on Trail #71 has occurred. However, these issues will be addressed through administration of their Special Use Permits and are therefore outside the scope of the Travel Plan decision.
Todd Orr		840		6 - Cinnamon - Suggest keeping open to motorcycle or implementing alternating day motorcycle use to reduce possible conflicts and satisfy both non and motorized group.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Todd Orr		840		73 - Cinnamon Lookout - Suggest keeping open to motorcycle or implementing alternating day motorcycle use to reduce possible conflicts and satisfy both non and motorized group.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Todd Orr		840		User made ATV trail from 33 west of Albino Lake thru section 35 to Dead Horse road - Suggest signing and closing to motorized use and access to closed Deadhorse road 136.	Taylor Fork	This route has been signed as closed. It was not designated for motorized use and would therefore be closed to all motorized use under Alternatives 2 through 7-M.
Todd Orr		840		63 - Lizard Lake - Suggest posing signs at all wilderness boundaries and closing the trail at Lizard Lake to motorized access to the west into section 20 and wilderness. Manage 6i3 as is for motorcycle use.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Todd Orr		840		Dead Horse Ridge Trail user made horse trail and needed access to connect from road in Dead Horse to 63 - Suggest managing as is for horse access to 63.	Taylor Fork	No alternative would restrict cross-country travel by stock or stock use of user-created routes in the Taylor Fork TPA. Although stock use would not be encouraged or emphasized on this route, it would be allowed.
Todd Orr		840		233 Taylor Sec. 1 - Suggest keeping open to motorcycle or implementing alternating day	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				motorcycle use to reduce possible conflicts and satisfy both non and motorized group.		Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Todd Orr		840		33 - Albino Lake - Suggest keeping open to motorcycle or implementing alternating day motorcycle use to reduce possible conflicts and satisfy both non and motorized group.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Todd Orr		840		Marble Lake Trail - A needed user made horse trail connecting 33 to 168. Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use loop back to Cinnamon Creek.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Todd Orr		840		168 - Cinnamon South - Suggest keeping open to motorcycle or implementing alternating day motorcycle use to reduce possible conflicts and satisfy both non and motorized group.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat.
Todd Orr		840		68 - Oil Well Road - Suggest signing and managing as is for motorized use. Manage as closed to ATV use at intersection with trail 203 before dropping over divide into Carrot Basin. Reduces ATV hunting pressure and ATV/horse-outfitter conflicts in Cabin Creek. Very few hunters ride motorcycles while ATVs extremely popular with hunters.	Taylor Fork	A range of options for managing motorcycle use in the Taylor Fork TPA were analyzed in the alternatives. Under Alternative 7-M, the configuration of motorcycle routes would provide for a connector from the Cabin Creek TPA, through Taylor Fork, to the Gallatin Crest via the Oil Well Road Trail #68 or Trail #203, to the Taylor Fork Road, to the Buck Creek Road, and to the Cinnamon Trail #30. It would also provide for continued motorcycle use to Lizard Lakes and a connector to the Buck Ridge trails. Summer motorized use would be prohibited on other trails in the Taylor Fork TPA to provide for non-motorized opportunities and grizzly bear core and other wildlife habitat. Under Alternative 7-M, ATV's would be allowed on the Oil Well Road Trail #68 to its junction with Trail #203, and on Trail #203 from this junction to Pika Point. This was to provide a high-quality recreational opportunity for ATV users in a larger area where such opportunities were substantially reduced relative to the current condition. Pika Point was selected as the end point for ATV use on this trail because it is a definable landscape feature and the trail north of this point is not conducive to ATV use due to vegetation and trail condition. The Oil Well Road Trail #68 and a portion of Trail #203 are trails where ATV use is consistent with the legislation establishing the Cabin Creek Recreation & Wildlife Management Area (see Roadless Issue in FEIS).
Kim and Kelly Kelsey		825	Bozeman	The proposed spring closures of trails would be difficult to work around. Each spring, regardless of the weather, we have some forty miles of fence to repair and get ready for the upcoming season. The arrival date of our first guests is not variable depending on the weather and consequently it is imperative that we be out in the forest working over these fences and clearing the trails around the ranch. Trail Number 71 as it leaves the Sage Creek	Taylor Fork	There would be no spring stock use restrictions for any trail within the Taylor Fork TPA under Alternative 7-M. Spring stock restrictions were not included on these trails because such blanket restrictions are not necessary to prevent trail damage. Mountain bikes would be allowed on Trail #71 under Alternative 7-M . The Forest Service has used signs and provided trail etiquette information at bike shops in recent years to warn mountain bikers of the potential for conflict with

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				parking lot and moves up the ridge between Wapiti and Sage Creek has recently been highlighted as a bicycle and motorized route. Its proximity to the dude ranches in the upper Gallatin seems like an opportunity for conflicts to occur. On the lower end this trail is extremely steep and rocky with very little opportunity to relocate it without substantial engineering and construction. Also, on Trail Number 71 the rerouting of the snowmobile trail from Wapiti trailhead to the Sage Creek trailhead again would appear to require substantial work to be able to put a groomer on it. I'm sure that people will continue to use the Oil Well Road as it drops down into the Wapiti Drainage which will also put them on the Taylor Fork Road with their snow machines mixed with vehicular traffic. This mixing of vehicles and snow machines has been a problem since the early 70's. I believe that moving this snowmobile access to the Slide Creek Trail Number 71 will put more snowmobiles on the Taylor Fork Road and will create additional damage. We would like to recommend that motorized vehicles not be allowed on Trail Number 223. It passes through some recently acquired critical wildlife habitat and puts those users well up into the Albino Lake Drainage and the Buck Creek Divide. I believe that Trail Number 63 should not be opened to motorized vehicles for some of the same reasons, as well as its termination at the wilderness boundary. A number of trails then enter the wilderness and it would appear that promoting motorized use in that area would invite wilderness trespass. We would encourage you to rethink the closure for snowmobiles in the Eldridge Creek Drainage. I believe that having Lightning Creek and the Taylor Fork as a boundary to snowmobile use would be much easier to determine rather than Trail Number 172. The Deadhorse Creek Road Number 136 has been proposed to be brought up to passenger car standards. Again, this road leads to some prime wildlife habitat and I believe the end of the road will become a spot for campfires, parties, and the associated trash. Cinnamon Creek Trail Number 6 is also subject of some concern. Its present course is very steep and the motorized use		stock users on this trail, and would continue to do so under Alternative 7-M. Motorcycle use would be prohibited on this trail under Alternative 7-M in part to reduce traffic levels and user conflicts. Trails #63 and #223 would be managed for non-motorized use to provide for this type of recreational experience along with habitat for grizzly bears and other wildlife. Passenger vehicles would be allowed on segment 1 of the Buck Creek Road because the high quality recreational opportunity provided would outweigh the negative effects to wildlife (which would be partially mitigated by implementing a July15-September 15 season of use). Alternative 7-M would greatly diminish the potential for snowmobile use on the Taylor Fork Road. The snowmobile trailhead would be re-routed to Sage Creek, and the Wapiti Road would be closed to snowmobile use thus precluding a loop route on the Taylor Fork Road back to the Sage Creek Trailhead. Eldridge Creek would be open to snowmobiles under Alternative 7-M because this area is much less important moose and elk winter range than adjacent areas.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				upon it has created some erosion issues.		
Julie Wagner		1598		I recommend that Corbly be changed to non-motorized status to allow the land to heal and that the northern accesses be changed from non-motorized to motorized.	West Bridgers North	Corbly Gulch access road is a County road. In Alt 7M, Limestone trail #544 would be restricted to motorcycle use only. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Jennifer Allain		875		Corbly Gulch: The access road has been deteriorating steadily for the past several years. Users, primarily ORV enthusiasts, have widened the road and caused huge ruts. Parts of this trail are very steep, and ORV users have created shortcuts to avoid steep areas, increasing trail erosion.	West Bridgers North	Corbly Gulch access road is a County road. In Alt 7M, Limestone trail #544 would be restricted to motorcycle use only. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 424 - History Rock - Motorized - Summer leave open - this is good to make a loop from History Rock to Langohr - Motorcycle and bike riding with a spur of trail over Cottonwood Canyon.	Hyalite	Current use is open to motorized. In Alt 7M, this loop would be closed to motorized use to provide a non motorized winter and summer opportunity on the east side of Hyalite drainage..
Joan Montagne		1692		I am also disappointed that motors will be emphasized on Historic Trail #516, the Bridger Foothills Trail #534 from its junction with middle Cottonwood north to Corbly and #586 Middle Cottonwood Trail as well as Truman Gulch #535. The motorized users show no respect for the muddy roads leading to these trailheads nor the land adjacent to the trails. I definitely object to a connector trail over Ross Pass! The traffic now is not bad but double or triple the motorized use and the Bridgers will seem like a racetrack. It is almost impossible to enjoy a quiet ski without listening to the whine of high marking snowmobiles.	West Bridgers South	Currently these trails are open to motorized use. In Alt 7M, Truman Gulch #535, Middle Cottonwood # 586 trails and the portions of the Foothills Trail #534 would be restricted to motorcycle use only. This portion of the trail will be proposed for reconstruction to motorcycle standard. The season of use would be more restrictive in Alt 7M than it is currently. Resource damage would be addressed through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance. In Alt 7M, the West Bridgers would be managed for non motorized recreational opportunities south of Middle Cottonwood. Foothills Trail #534 from the "M" parking lot would be closed to motorized use to prevent user conflicts. North Cottonwood is managed as non motorized. It would be closed to motorized in Alt 7M. The trail (#516) to the north is a nonsystem trail and not maintained. The relocated S Fork Road allows access to Ross Peak and Trail 534 will allow motorcycles to travel to the west side of the Bridgers and onto the Foothills trail system north of middle cottonwood.
Gail and John Richerdson		266	Bozeman	We live just west of the Bridgers and would prefer the trailheads of Truman Gulch, Middle Cottonwood, and Foothills be non-motorized. These trails are steep & often very narrow higher up; this is a safety hazard as well as a noise issue. Even mountain bikes have problems higher up on these trails,	West Bridgers South	Currently these trails are open to motorized use. In Alt 7M, Truman Gulch #535, Middle Cottonwood # 586 trails and the portions of the Foothills Trail #534 would be restricted to motorcycle use only. This portion of the trail would be reconstructed to motorcycle standard. The season of use would be more restrictive in Alt 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				although we wouldn't exclude them.		Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in gaining compliance.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301		We believe Corbly Gulch 544, Truman Gulch 535, Middle Cottonwood 586 trails and the portions of the Foothills Trail 534 for connecting them should be managed for nonmotorized use only. Further, we support the proposal to managed the M. trail and Sypes Canyon 531 as nonmotorized to prevent user conflicts and help maintain public safety on these popular, heavily used trails.	West Bridgers North	Currently these trails are open to motorized use. In Alt 7M, Limestone # 544, Truman Gulch #535, Middle Cottonwood # 586 trails and the portions of the Foothills Trail #534 would be restricted to motorcycle use only. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in gaining compliance. Sypes is currently closed to motorized use and would continue closed in Alt 7M. Portions of the "M" system are currently open to motorized use. The "M" trail system would be managed for nonmotorized in Alt 7M.
Jim Schipf		854		I don't know where the M trail stands for mountain bikes but I can ride a loop from Sypes Canyon and out the M trail. I would like to see it stay open.	West Bridgers South	Currently , The Bridger Foothills Trail #534 and Sypes Canyon Trail #531 are open to mountain bike use. This route would remain open to mountain bike use in Alt 7M. Trails #511, 512, 513 accessing the "M" monument would be closed to mountain bike use.
Greg Beardslee		737		The illegal Bridger motorcycle trail: I do not feel the user made motorcycle trail in the West Bridger's needs to be shut down to motorcyclists or anyone else. I think that it should be a system trail to the ridge. However, I don't advocate riding motorcycles or mountain bikes along the ridge, just riding up to a viewpoint or to the top of Baldy. The trail needs two switchbacks constructed in order to make it sustainable. It has a history that is over 30 years old.	West Bridgers South	Currently there is no system trail off Trail #534 from Sypes Canyon to the top of Mount Baldy . In Alt 7M, the Bridger Ridge area will be closed to motorized use. However, motorized routes to the ridge would include Limestone Trail #544 and Ross Pass Trail #525.
Joe Polus		1487		Motorized Trail to Baldy Mnt. from #534: Trail was built and established over a two year period in 1970 and 1971 by Neil Kelly, Phil Ablin and Ron Ablin. We discussed the possibility of moving the closure farther up the trail (~1 mi from Baldy Mnt) as an alternative.	West Bridgers South	Currently there is no system trail off Trail #534 from Sypes canyon to the top of Mount Baldy . In Alt 7M, the Bridger Ridge area will be closed to motorized use. However, motorized routes to the ridge would include Limestone Trail #544 and Ross Pass Trail #525.
Todd Orr		840		Baldy Ridge Trail from Sypes: manage as is for motorized use.	West Bridgers South	Currently there is no system trail off Trail #534 from Sypes Canyon to the top of Mount Baldy . In Alt 7M, the Bridger Ridge area will be closed to motorized use. However, motorized routes to the ridge would include Limestone Trail #544 and Ross Pass Trail #525.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Discussion about motorized trail to Baldy Mtn from #534 - we discussed the possibility of moving the closure farther up the trail (~1 mile from baldy mtn)	West Bridgers South	Currently there is no system trail off Trail #534 from Sypes canyon to the top of Mount Baldy . In Alt 7M, the Bridger Ridge area will be closed to motorized use.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				as an alternative.		However, motorized routes to the ridge would include Limestone Trail #544 and Ross Pass Trail #525.
Becky Johnson		1353		Upper Eagle Creek, Baldy Road, Bear Fork road, Ash Mountain Road: these roads serve no vehicular purpose and should be closed in motorized vehicles. They access no trailheads or campgrounds. There is no easily accessible fire would left in these areas. And noxious weeds (knapweed, toadflax, whitetop, hounds tongue) continue to spread up these travel ways. Furthermore, these roads traverse prime, high altitude wildlife habitat. They are great for non-motorized recreation.	Gardiner Basin	Driving for pleasure remains one of the greatest uses of national forest system lands. In the Bear Creek area, many older folks still enjoy this opportunity on these roads. In addition, firewood will continue to be periodically available and accessible to the general public. Many hunters, particularly older folks, enjoy the opportunity to hunt adjacent to these roads. Some people take advantage of elevation gains to access higher terrain for hiking or hunting.
Pat Meyers		1101		I oppose the building of a loop or any new roads. Building new loop roads, which often become raceways for various modes of transportation, at the expense of historic, well established, corridor access roads just does not make sense. Rather than embark on such a questionable venture, the better choice is to use the money to better maintain the roads and strictly enforce the rules we presently have in place.	Cooke City	Early in the travel plan process we received comments suggesting that a loop opportunity in the Huckleberry-Tradenic area would be positive. We proposed such a loop in several alternatives, including Alternative 7. Public comment has been overwhelmingly opposed to providing loop ATV opportunities in the Cooke City area. In alternative 7M, the Forest Service proposes no loop opportunity in the Tradenic area. A short connector route would provide a loop opportunity in the Henderson Mountain area. The Forest Service will continue to attempt to reduce sedimentation from roads and enforce the closures that are currently in place.
Dean and Madelein Bladow		1191	Cooke City	We are oppose to the Huckleberry Lake ATV Loop. We believe that creating this loop would have the potential for creating a "race track" for extreme ATV users and would cross wetlands. That is not a appropriate use of this area.	Cooke City	Early in the travel plan process we received comments suggesting that a loop opportunity in the Huckleberry-Tradenic area would be positive. We proposed such a loop in several alternatives, including Alternative 7. Public input has been very much opposed to providing the loop opportunity if the Lake Abundance or Goose Lake roads are shortened as mitigation for constructing the loops. Alternative 7M proposes to eliminate the loop opportunities in favor of status quo on the Abundance and Goose Lake roads.
Robert Weinstein		1609	Cooke City	Under Alternative 7 there is an opportunity to create new loops/trails and pull back existing trails to Lake Abundance and to Goose Lake. Locals and outside ATV users have come to rely on these trails for years. They give us quick access to the Wilderness areas which we can hike into for good fishing, camping, wildlife viewing etc. Adding more mileage onto these day hikes is not a good thing. The new loops are something we don't have now and can	Cooke City	Early in the travel plan process we received comments suggesting that a loop opportunity in the Huckleberry-Tradenic area would be positive. We proposed such a loop in several alternatives, including Alternative 7. Public input has been very much opposed to providing the loop opportunity if the Lake Abundance or Goose Lake roads are shortened as mitigation for constructing the loops. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service proposes to eliminate the loop opportunities in favor of status quo

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				obviously live without.		on the Abundance and Goose Lake roads.
Thomas Henry		1328A	Laurel	We would like to keep the road to Goose Lake and Abundance to remain open to the point that is open to now. Leave all trails that are not on the travel management map to remain open for multiple use in the Brass Monkey area.	Cooke City	Early in the travel plan process we received comments suggesting that a loop opportunity in the Huckleberry-Tradenic area would be positive. We proposed such a loop in several alternatives, including Alternative 7. Public input has been very much opposed to providing the loop opportunity if the Lake Abundance or Goose Lake roads are shortened as mitigation for constructing the loops. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service proposes to eliminate the loop opportunities in favor of status quo on the Abundance and Goose Lake roads.
Nellie Isreal	Beartooth Alliance	669		We strongly oppose the closure/decommissioning of Goose Lake Road #3230 Seg. 2. This road is important access to fishing lakes, to Wilderness trailheads, and to backcountry scenery. We recommend seasonal use be the same as Seg. 1 as recommended in this letter.	Cooke City	Early in the travel plan process we received comments suggesting that a loop opportunity in the Huckleberry-Tradenic area would be positive. We proposed such a loop in several alternatives, including Alternative 7. Public input has been very much opposed to providing the loop opportunity if the Lake Abundance or Goose Lake roads are shortened as mitigation for constructing the loops. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service proposes to eliminate the loop opportunities in favor of status quo on the Abundance and Goose Lake roads.
Nellie Isreal	Beartooth Alliance	669		We are opposed to the Huckleberry Lake ATV loop. We believe that creating this loop would have the potential for creating a "race track" for extreme ATV users and would cross wetlands. That is not an appropriate use of this area.	Cooke City	Early in the travel plan process we received comments suggesting that a loop opportunity in the Huckleberry-Tradenic area would be positive. We proposed such a loop in several alternatives, including Alternative 7. Public input has been very much opposed to providing the loop opportunity if the Lake Abundance or Goose Lake roads are shortened as mitigation for constructing the loops. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service proposes to eliminate the loop opportunities in favor of status quo on the Abundance and Goose Lake roads.
Norbert Lehenbauer		398	Cooke City	Making these loops makes good sense. The Henderson trail, the Huckleberry Lake loop etc. Some of these have existed in the past and would require very little to reopen. The one by Huckleberry Lake needs to be relocated up from the Lake on dryer land. The last time I was there some people had driven in the wet areas near the lake, causing damage. These loops will give a better experience for those just going for a ride and an opportunity for some us to take the grand kids fishing for some little brookies, like in Huckleberry, Bob & Dick, etc.	Cooke City	Early in the travel plan process we received comments suggesting that a loop opportunity in the Huckleberry-Tradenic area would be positive. We proposed such a loop in several alternatives, including Alternative 7. Public input has been very much opposed to providing the loop opportunity if the Lake Abundance or Goose Lake roads are shortened as mitigation for constructing the loops. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service proposes to eliminate the loop opportunities in favor of status quo on the Abundance and Goose Lake roads.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Dean and Madelein Bladow		1191	Cooke City	We do not support Alternative 7 of the Cooke City planning area in its entirely. We support keeping open for motorized vehicle use the roads to Goose Lake, Sheep Mountain, and Lake Abundance. These roads offer access to fishing lakes, Wilderness Area trails, and scenic vistas that encourage responsible use of National Forest lands by the public.	Cooke City	Early in the travel plan process we received comments suggesting that a loop opportunity in the Huckleberry-Tradenic area would be positive. We proposed such a loop in several alternatives, including Alternative 7. Public input has been very much opposed to providing the loop opportunity if the Lake Abundance or Goose Lake roads are shortened as mitigation for constructing the loops. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service proposes to eliminate the loop opportunities in favor of status quo on the Abundance and Goose Lake roads.
John and Carole Oldemeyer		839	Silver Gate, MT	We support keeping open for motorized vehicle use the roads to Goose Lake, Sheep Mountain and Lake Abundance. These roads offer access to fishing lakes, Wilderness Area trails, and scenic vistas that encourage responsible use of the National Forest lands by the public. We urge the Forest Service to re-evaluate the opening date for road use by wheeled vehicles (and horses). While we don't support use of roads still soft and wet from winter snow, we believe that a July 1 date would be environmentally acceptable for most years. When that is not the case, the roads could be closed temporarily until they are dried and hardened. With regard to Lake Abundance Road #3219 Seg. 3, we oppose closure of this segment and we strongly urge the Forest Service to keep this road open during the same season as Segs 1 & 2. This road is used by fisherman almost daily during the summer and by hunters in the fall. We recommend, following the general objective of Goal 3, that a bridge be built across the Stillwater River on the Lake Abundance Road to greatly reduce erosion in the Stillwater River.	Cooke City	Early in the travel plan process we received comments suggesting that a loop opportunity in the Huckleberry-Tradenic area would be positive. We proposed such a loop in several alternatives, including Alternative 7. Public input has been very much opposed to providing the loop opportunity if the Lake Abundance or Goose Lake roads are shortened as mitigation for constructing the loops. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service proposes to eliminate the loop opportunities in favor of status quo on the Abundance and Goose Lake roads. We will look at alternatives to reduce sedimentation in the Stillwater during the summer of 2006.
Kim McIntyre	Outward Bound	948	Red Lodge	I recommend closing the last two miles of the Goose Lake and Lake Abundance to 1) lessen the impact to the land and the wilderness, 2) improve the experience of wilderness for non-motorized travel and 3) make management and law enforcement easier. Huckleberry Lake area: we would not be able to utilitize this valuable area if it were to become motorized. We should not have to give up non-motorized recreation and our outdoor commercial business (Outward Bound) to add to the already	Motorized (General)	Early in the travel plan process we received comments suggesting that a loop opportunity in the Huckleberry-Tradenic area would be positive. We proposed such a loop in several alternatives, including Alternative 7. Public input has been very much opposed to providing the loop opportunity if the Lake Abundance or Goose Lake roads are shortened as mitigation for constructing the loops. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service proposes to eliminate the loop opportunities in favor of status quo on the Lake Abundance and Goose Lake roads.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				massive motorized routes in this area.		
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	619a		A body of scientific work exists to document degradation to streambed and surrounding riparian from motorized vehicle intrusions and can be extracted from the tables provided in the EA. MWF requests that riparian health be given a high priority in the final decision, best characterized by Alternative 6.	Issues	Effects to riparian habitat was analyzed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. The proposed programmatic language for Alternative 7M does include management direction for riparian areas. Specifically, GOAL E and H address riparian habitats and direction is provided to fully support the protection of riparian habitats. In addition, the proposed goals, objectives, and standards for individual TPAs that provide for road or trail systems that protect soil and watershed conditions, would also serve to maintain riparian areas in good condition and minimize potential impacts to wildlife species within riparian areas. Alternative 7M included additional TPAs than were proposed in the DEIS alternatives. Meeting all of these goals, objectives, and standards would lessen impacts to riparian areas and the direct and indirect effects on wildlife.
Loren Blanksma		1194		I think that it is appropriate to close the Bridger Foothills trail on the south end of the M because of the extensive hiker use. However, this trail should remain open to motorcycles from Sacagawea peak to the junction of the uninventoried, user created South Baldy trail. The south Baldy trail should then also remain open to motorcycles.	West Bridgers South	Foothills Trail #534 from the "M" parking lot to Middle Cottonwood Trail #586. Would be closed to motorized use to address user conflicts. Bridger Foothill Trail #534 would be open to motorized use north of Middle Cottonwood to Limestone trail #544. Currently there is no system trail to the top of Mount Baldy from Trail #534. In Alt 7M, the Bridger Ridge area will be closed to motorized use. However, motorized routes to the ridge would include Limestone Trail #544 and Ross Pass Trail #525.
Todd Orr		840		534 - BFT - Bridgers Foothills Trail - Suggest managing as closed to motorized use to Sypes Canyon to allow a non-threatening foot and dog use trail. Suggest closing to mountain bikes for the same reason.	West Bridgers South	Foothills Trail #534 from the "M" parking lot to Middle Cottonwood trail #586 would be closed to motorized use to address user conflicts. Sypes Canyon Trail #531 is currently closed to motorized use and would continue closed in Alt 7M. The EIS discussed the alternative for no mountain bikes on this route, but I don't know the outcome...
John Maykuth		1417	Bozeman	Road 206, particularly the portion in section 21, Township 2 South, Range 14 East, from its junction with the West Fork of Upper Deer Creek south to the end of the present use by cars and trucks. I request the present designation be changed to backcountry road (not suitable for passenger cars), motorcycles and ATV allowed. The area contains some unique features which make this designation unnecessarily		Forest Road 206 is proposed to be kept open to full-size motor vehicles to it's junction with the Dore Creek road system in Section 25.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				restrictive. The stream beds at the several fords in this section are composed of large cobbles or solid rock. No turbidity is created by vehicle passage. Except during flood stage the water is not deep enough to contact the undercarriage of a truck. The soils in the existing road are generally well-drained coarser sandy material. There are only two places where very minimal rutting occurs primarily during very wet weather. The effects of travel and recreation on riparian areas are minute compared to the effects of cattle grazing. Springs or small streams dry up during the late summer and early fall. This causes the cattle to concentrate in the creek bottom. During one or two of the recent dry years there was nothing left in the creek bottom but dirt, rocks, and small brush. The effects of any restriction on travel to protect riparian vegetation would be infinitesimal under these conditions. The new restriction will add an extra mile of walking for someone without a trail vehicle. This may not mean much to a pair of 25 year-old legs that I can assure it means a hell of a lot to 70 year legs. The present. Designation would leave only one small area available to people without trail vehicles for camping. It will concentrate activities in the area. There will likely be a higher incidence of vandalism and confrontations.		
Todd Orr		840		108 - West Fork of Upper Deer Creek - Old Road - suggest managing as is - open to motorized use.		From the end of Forest Road 206 in Section 25, the West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112 under Alternative 7-M. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorized vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does.
Noreen Breeding		454		Garnet Mountain Trail #85: It should also be closed to bicycles because it is too steep and narrow for safe bicycle travel.	Gallatin Roaded	Garnet Mountain Trail #85 is currently managed for multiple recreational uses. In Alt 7M, it would be closed to motorized use. Alternative 7M would manage this route for foot, stock and mountain bike travel. This route, though challenging, has become popular with

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						more advanced mountain bikers. Traffic is generally light, and we feel that the trail can accommodate all three uses safely. Additional trail signing and user education will facilitate this shared use.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	Garnet Mountain Trail # 85. Alternative 7 reasonably designated this trail as non motorized. How ever, it should also be closed to bicycles because it is to steep and narrow for safe bicycle travel.	Gallatin Roaded	Garnet Mountain Trail #85 is currently managed for multiple recreational uses. In Alt 7M, it would be closed to motorized use. Alternative 7M would manage this route for foot, stock and mountain bike travel. This route, though challenging, has become popular with more advanced mountain bikers. Traffic is generally light, and we feel that the trail can accommodate all three uses safely. Additional trail signing and user education will facilitate this shared use.
Loren Blanksma		1194		Even though the Garnet Mountain trail (85) is a nice motorcycle ride, it would be acceptable to close that trail to motorcycles to provide a short non-motorized trails for hikers in this area, but in exchange, the motorized access to Garnet Mountain Outlook through Rat Lake must be maintained as it currently is.	Gallatin Roaded	Garnet mtn trail #85 would be closed to all motorized use to provide a non-motorized access route to the lookout tower. The trail to the lookout from Rat Lake would remain open to motorized use in the preferred alternative.
Karen Bucklin Sanchez		507	Bozeman	…apparently the area is considered sacred by the Crow. It seems like this needs to be a consideration and respected. I assume that motorized traffic would impact that value.	East Crazies	GNF has been in continual consultation with the Crow to develop a responsive Travel Plan in the Crazy Mountains that is respectful to Crow values. Motorized uses have been identified as having the potential to affect the suitability of areas used by Crow Traditionalists for traditional purposes. 7-M provides protection of those areas. (Please see 06.03.08_Allen_Crow Meetings for a fuller explanation).
Darrin Old Coyote	Apsaalooke Nation Cultural Commission (Crow)	901	Crow Agency	We are opposed to all motorized recreation anywhere in the Crazy Mtns. This area has been a sacred site to the Apsaalooke people for thousands of years.	East Crazies	GNF has met 19 times with Crow/Apsaalooke delegations since December of 2002 in consultation regarding this issue. Mr. Old Coyote's position (as a Cultural Committee Member in 2002) has been the starting point and the consistent position of Crow delegates over that time period. However, due to the checkerboard federal/private ownership pattern in the Crazies it was soon realized that there was no simple travel management design that would completely satisfy this tenet. Continued work with the Crow Cultural Committee provided guidance for where the most important areas were to the Crow and how compromises could be considered. The Cultural Committee delegated by the Crow Tribal Government has taken the lead in assisting this effort and has worked alongside the GNF

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						in consultation regarding all the adjustments from this basic tenet. (Please see 06.03.08_Allen_Crow Meetings for a fuller explanation of GNF/Crow Nation consultation).
Catherine Weeden		1604		As for the Hidden Lakes, it is a crime against future generations to allow the kind of pounding these areas will receive by being open to ATVs and motorcycles. The GNF must restrict them from the damaging and wholesale user that will result from leaving the trails motorized over the next 15 years.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Hidden Lakes Trail #179 is currently open to motorized use. The preferred alternative 7M would continue to manage this lake designation route for access by motorcycles and ATVs. Some trail improvements would need to be made in the future to protect resources and provide a route that meets minimum engineering standards for the target vehicles.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		Trails in the Hidden Lakes area should be closed to ATVs to prevent trespass into the WSA. The trail to Hidden Lakes is easy to hike but is very rocky and steep for people on machines, and not suitable for motorized travel any way.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Hidden Lakes Trail #179 is currently open to motorized use. The preferred alternative 7M would continue to manage this lake designation route for access by motorcycles and ATVs. Some trail improvements would need to be made in the future to protect resources and provide a route that meets minimum engineering standards for the target vehicles.
Todd Orr		840		179 - Hidden Lakes - Suggest signing and managing as closed to motorized use to maintain a quiet, non-motorized atmosphere for fishermen and campers at Hidden lakes.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Hidden Lakes Trail #179 is currently open to motorized use. The preferred alternative 7M would continue to manage this lake designation route for access by motorcycles and ATVs. Some trail improvements would need to be made in the future to protect resources and provide a route that meets minimum engineering standards for the target vehicles.
Albert and Susan Wells		867	Belgrade	Over the last decade, winter use by illegal cross-country skiers, coming down "out of bounds" from Bridger Bowl has also become a concern to us. Opening up a more definitive trail will only increase the temptation to try to severe avalanche danger the west face develops each season.	West Bridgers South	I assume the commenter is concerned about out of bound skiing from Bridger Bowl. This past season, the Forest Service provided access points to allow egress to backcountry skiing. Managing out of bounds skiing at Bridger Bowl is outside the scope of travel planning.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The West Bridger trail is the only access from the West Bridger road to the Deer Creek cabin and the balance of the Deer Creek area. This rail should remain open as a motorized loop connector trail so as not to isolate West Bridger.		If Alternative 7-M is selected the Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be proposed for construction to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridger area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the Jims' Gulch Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area.
Todd Orr		840		129 - Jims Gulch - Suggest managing as is open to motorized use to allow access to the Deer Creeks area.		If Alternative 7-M is selected, the Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be proposed for construction to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the Jims' Gulch Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area.
Doug Poehls		718		Trail #129 to interconnect #5 and the West Bridger Trailhead.		If Alternative 7-M is selected, the Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be proposed for reconstruction to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridger area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the Jims' Gulch Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area.
Judy A. Rue	Sweet Grass County Recreation Association	1123		Keep all of Jims Gulch open for loop access and challenge.		If Alternative 7-M is selected, Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be proposed for construction to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the Jims' Gulch Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						activities in this unstable area.
Judy A. Rue	Sweet Grass County Recreation Association	1123		Keep all of Tie Cutter Gulch open for loop access.		If Alternative 7-M is selected, Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be proposed for construction to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridger area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256.
Anton Miller		154	Laurel	My concern is the East Boulder area of Dry Creek and on the Moccasin Lake. Right now an ATV trail passes through some private property. My question is what the future through this property is?	Deer Creeks	In 2004 the road was relocated to National Forest System Land.
Nellie Isreal	Beartooth Alliance	669		With regard to x-c ski trails south of highway 212, we support closure to snowmobiles except in the following cases: 1) the Bannock Trail from Silver Gate to Cooke City (while not specifically listed in the plan and is a county road) should remain open to groomed snowmobile use. This trail is important access to Cooke City and Silver Gate for winter residents of the Bannock Trail and Silver Gate. Closure would result in illegal snowmobile use of Highway 212, the Bannock trail, and through private property between Silver Gate and Cooke City. When some highway department begins plowing Highway 212 from Pilot Creek to Cooke City during winter, this will be the only direct access between Cooke City and Coulter Pass and from either community to the groomed Fisher Creek and Daisy Pass trails by snowmobile. This route is critical to the winter economy of businesses in both communities.	Cooke City	In all alternatives the Bannock Trail remains open to snowmobiles between Silver Gate and Cooke City. We agree that at some future point, should Hwy 212 be plowed winter-long, the best alternative for a groomed snowmobile route may be south of the highway.
Geoffrey Stephens		981	Bozeman	Opportunities for quiet non-motorized use outside of the wilderness are very limited. Sheep Basin and Woody Creek should be reserved for non-motorized users. Both are close to town and provide an easily accessible play area for non-motorized users.	Cooke City	In all alternatives, motorized use of Sheep Basin Road is limited to administrative use only. In no alternative is it proposed to open the area up to summer motorized travel.
Todd Orr		840		66 - Hidden Lakes to Porcupine Divide - Suggest managing as open to motorized use to Porcupine Divide at intersection with 194. Sign and manage as closed to ATV use from the divide down first creek into Porcupine to prevent further extension of ATV trail on a single track trail. Manage as open to motorcycle use.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	In Alt 7M ATVs would be allowed from the trailhead of Hidden Divide #66 to Hidden Lakes #179. From this junction the trail would be open only to motorcycles.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Hyalite Drainage - Front Country Family Use - Close right hand side of drainage (ex. Blackmore & History Rock) to snowmobile use. Open left hand side (e.g. Moser Cr) to family snowmobile use.	Hyalite	In Alt 7M snowmobiles would be allowed north of the Moser Rd cutoff and a designated route through a closed area south to the Palisades area, from there, snowmobiles would be allowed on designated routes to E.Fork trailhead and Grotto Falls trailhead. Please refer to the ROD for the final decision and the rationale for it.
Shelly McMullen	BWAGs	1028	Bozeman	Windy Pass: there was evidence of motorized vehicles that had previously ridden off the trail and the destruction to the vegetation was heart wrenching.	Gallatin Crest	In Alt 7M Windy Pass trail would be managed as a non-motorized route for foot and stock travel. A goal of the preferred alternative would be to return this route to a single track trail through normal maintenance over time. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Albert and Susan Wells		1741	Belgrade	It has been our unfortunate chore to police illegal fires and gun fire at the trailhead of the Truman access for many years. We can only imagine the danger that would come with motorized use facilitated by the USFS. As owners of two ATVs on our small ranch, we understand they are fun and they are useful when operated in a proper place. Truman Gulch and the West Bridger's overly steep access routes is most assuredly not one of them.	West Bridgers South	In Alt 7M, ATVS would not be allowed within the West Bridgers area south of North Cottonwood. Illegal activities at trailheads continue to be a law enforcement concern. Contact the Bozeman District Ranger regarding this issue.
Todd Orr		840		Numerous short dead-end user made jeep trails exist along the Langohr road. Some offer a campsite away from the road and likely will not be extended due to topography, while others should be signed and closed to motorized use to prevent possible resource damage and erosion.	Hyalite	In Alt 7M, proposed Forest wide Standard A-8 was modified to read: "Wheeled motorized vehicle travel will be allowed to access a campsite within 300 feet of a designated road or trail unless specifically restricted or unless such use would result in damage or unreasonable disturbance to soil, water, wildlife or vegetative resources."
Terry Cunningham		1725	Bozeman	We request that the Middle Cottonwood trail - on the west side of the Bridgers- be closed to motorized travel. The reasons for this request are: The Middle Cottonwood trail is easily accessible and serves as a popular destination for quick recreational hikes and trail runs on the weekends and after work; Very little motorized recreation takes place here; There are several stream crossings on this trail and adding motorbikes and ATVs would result in spread of noxious weeds and undo recent work done by crews to return the creek flow to its natural borders; Middle Cottonwood is also a popular horse trail.	West Bridgers South	In Alt 7M, the West Bridgers would be managed for non motorized recreational opportunities south of Middle Cottonwood. Currently Middle Cottonwood Trail # 586 is open to motorized use. In Alt 7M, Middle Cottonwood Trail # 586 would be restricted to motorcycle use only. No ATV use in the West Bridger South Travel Planning Area would be allowed in Alt 7M. The season of use for motorcycles would be more restrictive in Alt 7M. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Valerie Harms		19	Bozeman	I am a regular user of the Bridger's. Please keep those trails non-motorized to protect the wildlife and quietude for hikers and cross-country skiers.	West Bridgers South	In Alt 7M, the West Bridgers would be managed for non motorized recreational opportunities south of Middle Cottonwood. Currently Middle Cottonwood Trail # 586

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Truman Gulch and Middle Cottonwood are two of my absolute favorite places in the world because of their SILENCE.		is open to motorized use. In Alt 7M, Middle Cottonwood Trail # 586 and Truman Gulch #535 would be restricted to motorcycle use only. No ATV use in the West Bridger South Travel Planning Area would be allowed in Alt 7M. The season of use for motorcycles would be more restrictive in Alt 7M. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Vanda Gallagher	BWAGs	915	Bozeman	Middle Cottonwood is a beautiful stream. Kids like to paddle in it, dogs like to cool off in it and people like to relax on the stream banks. We traditional users far outnumber motorcycle riders who tend to be young men. Please do not sacrifice this trail to motorcycle riders which would benefit the few at the expense of the many. Emphasizing motorcycle travel up Truman Gulch will only make for more conflict and potential injury to traditional trail users.	West Bridgers South	In Alt 7M, the West Bridgers would be managed for non motorized recreational opportunities south of Middle Cottonwood. Currently Middle Cottonwood Trail # 586 is open to motorized use. In Alt 7M, Middle Cottonwood Trail # 586 and Truman Gulch #535 would be restricted to motorcycle use only. No ATV use in the West Bridger South Travel Planning Area would be allowed in Alt 7M. The season of use for motorcycles would be more restrictive in Alt 7M. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
William C. Patric and Aimee Boulanger		1114	Bozeman	given the steepness of SW Bridgers Trail, their popularity with hikers, the damage and degradation caused by a small number of motorized users, the FS track record with enforcement, and the proximity of these trails to Bozeman and Belgrade, it is absolutely inappropriate to promote motorized use on the Corbly, Truman, and Middle Cottonwood Trails.	West Bridgers South	In Alt 7M, the West Bridgers would be managed for non motorized recreational opportunities south of Middle Cottonwood. Currently Middle Cottonwood Trail # 586, Limestone Creek #533, and Truman Gulch #535 is open to motorized use. In Alt 7M, Middle Cottonwood Trail # 586, Limestone Trail #544, and Truman Gulch #535 would be restricted to motorcycle use only. No ATV use in the West Bridger South Travel Planning Area would be allowed in Alt 7M. The season of use for motorcycles would be more restrictive in Alt 7M. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Tamara Hampel		922	Bozeman	I'm writing to urge the FS to designate Middle Cottonwood, Truman, Corbly Gulch, the foothills trail, M, Sypes, N Cottonwood & Mineshaft trails as non-motorized. It doesn't take but a few ATVs or motorcycles on these trails to ruin the experience of a peaceful, rejuvenating day for a hundred hikers. It's also incredibly unsafe for hikers to share these trails w/ motorcycles and ATVs.	West Bridgers South	In Alt 7M, the West Bridgers would be managed for non motorized recreational opportunities south of Middle Cottonwood. Currently Truman Gulch #535, Middle Cottonwood # 586 , Limestone trail #544 trails are open to motorized use. In Alt 7M, Truman Gulch #535, Middle Cottonwood # 586 , Limestone trail #544 trails and the portions of the Foothills Trail #534 would be restricted to motorcycle use only. No ATV use in the West Bridger South Travel Planning Area would be allowed in Alt 7M. The season of use for motorcycles, mountain bikes, and stock would be more restrictive in Alt 7M. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance. Foothills Trail #534 from the "M" parking lot to Middle Cottonwood trail #586 would be closed to motorized use to address user conflicts.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Sypes Canyon Trail #531 is currently closed to motorized use and would continue closed in Alt 7M. Portions of the "M" system are currently open to motorized use. The "M" trail system would be managed for hiking use only in Alt 7M.North Cottonwood Trail #545 is managed as non motorized. It would be closed to motorized in Alt 7M.
Rebecca Weed	Montana Lamb & Wool	636	Belgrade	I am very worried about the Corbly/Truman/North Cottonwood and Foothills Trail. The Forest Service would inadvertently create a setup for huge conflict, by designating trails that are suitable for short family hikes in to the high country with close access to town, as a major and emphasized motorized park. The trails in this portion of the West Bridgers are especially unsuitable for motorized use. The West Bridger trails are a special resource for Belgrade and Bozeman residents - it is not a major expedition to get up into the hills on foot. Other practical concerns such as weed spread, fire danger, shooting gallery hangouts are already real issues, but would almost certainly become more serious and urgent with enhanced motorized use, considering the demographic changes occurring in this Valley, and the potential of bottlenecking created by the Plan.	West Bridgers South	In Alt 7M, the West Bridgers would be managed for non motorized recreational opportunities south of Middle Cottonwood. Currently Truman Gulch #535, Middle Cottonwood # 586 , Limestone trail #544 trails are open to motorized use. In Alt 7M, Truman Gulch #535, Middle Cottonwood # 586 , Limestone trail #544 trails and the portions of the Foothills Trail #534 would be restricted to motorcycle use only. The season of use would be more restrictive in Alt 7M than it is currently. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance. Foothills Trail #534 from the "M" parking lot would be closed to motorized use to address user conflicts. North Cottonwood Trail #545 is managed as non motorized. It would be closed to motorized in Alt 7M.
Michael Smith		229	Bozeman	This is one area in which I would like to see more restrictions and that is the South Bridger area, specifically the Middle Cottonwood Canyon (586) and Truman Gulch (535). I believe motorcycle use would seriously disrupt the tranquility and solitude of the beautiful area.	West Bridgers South	In Alt 7M, the West Bridgers would be managed for non motorized recreational opportunities south of Middle Cottonwood. Middle Cottonwood Trail #586 and Truman Gulch trail #535 are currently open to motorized use. They would remain open to motorcycle use in Alt 7M. No ATV use would be allowed on these trails. The season of use would be more restrictive in Alt 7M. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Scott Bosse		130	Bozeman	This is a major social use conflict over by far there are more hikers with dogs that use the middle fork Cottonwood trail that there are trail bikes.	West Bridgers South	In Alt 7M, the West Bridgers would be managed for non motorized recreational opportunities south of Middle Cottonwood. Middle Cottonwood Trail #586 would remain open to motorcycle use, however the season of use would be more restrictive in Alt 7M.
Susan Schwab		552	Belgrade	I seriously believe that if motorized vehicles were allowed on that trail, that our senior citizens would not feel safe enough to amble so slowly along those paths. I doubt that a mother would risk running the	West Bridgers South	In Alt 7M, the West Bridgers would be managed for non motorized recreational opportunities south of Middle Cottonwood. Sypes Canyon Trail #531 is currently closed to motorized use and would continue closed in Alt

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				trail with her children; I doubt that young families would put their children in jeopardy of running into a motorized vehicle that isn't being operated responsibly. … but it seems to me that if someone has the means to own a motorized vehicle, then that person can travel a bit further to access areas that allow motorized vehicles. Please, can't the FS provide a safe, quiet place for the broad community who does not have access to motorized trail transportation.		7M. Portions of the "M" system are currently open to motorized use. The "M" trail system would be managed for hiking only use in Alt 7M.
Jim and Marion Kraus		1746		I support keeping snowmobiles out of Hyalite Canyon. This will finally give Bozeman's population a nearby place for family non-motorized recreation. While Bozeman and Sourdough Creeks are non-motorized they do not have the space required for all around family recreation. Gallatin Roaded and Bear Canyon are motorized - these both flank Hyalite Canyon.	Hyalite	In Alt 7M, a snowmobile route would be authorized, but the main emphasis of winter use in Hyalite Canyon would remain non motorized.
Joe Polus		1487		Snowmobile use in the Hyalite Drainage: Front Country Family Use - Close right hand side of drainage (ex. Blackmore 7 History Rock to snowmobile use) and open left hand side (e.g. Moser Creek) to family snowmobile use.	Hyalite	In Alt 7M, a snowmobile route would be authorized, but the main emphasis of winter use in Hyalite Canyon would remain non motorized.
Jon Schwedler		1126		Restrictions on snowmobiles in Hyalite Canyon should be implemented. That place is a zoo when it snows, and excludes other users from the area whenever it snows. I have witnessed people shooting pistols from snowmobiles on the road - completely out of control.	Hyalite	In Alt 7M, a snowmobile route would be authorized, but the main emphasis of winter use in Hyalite Canyon would remain non motorized. Addressing shooting problems is outside the scope of the travel planning. Contact the Bozeman District Ranger to discuss this issue.
James Secor		973	Bozeman	I am looking for quality experiences and enjoy loop opportunities such as East Windy Pass #177 with #180, #96 Seg 2 combined. I also enjoy Garnet Mtn trail #85 combined w/ #132 seg 1, #3112, seg 1,2,3; trails on the Gallatin Crest #434 and #427. All of these trails are compatible for multiple use and dispersed uses.	Gallatin Crest	In Alt 7M, all these trails south of Windy Pass would be closed to motorcycle use in Alt 7M to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities, and to provide for grizzly bear and other wildlife security. Loop trails would be provided on the Porcupine and Buffalo Horn trails. Refer to the ROD for the final decision and the rationale for it. Also garnet mtn trail would be closed to all motorized use to provide a non- motorized access route to the lookout. Motorized use on these trails#132 seg 1, #3112, seg 1,2,3; trails is an existing use and will remain open under Alternative 7-M. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the Forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Reopen the Onion basin trail # 34 to Eaglehead to Motorcycle use. Except for a few horses, Motorcycles are the only one that use this trail.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5 to provide quality motorized single track riding on a historically used route. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to provide quiet non-motorized recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat.
Joe Polus		1487		Keep the small section of the Crest Trail above Onion Basin open to prevent motorcyclists from having to drop down into the lower more populated trails around the Buffalo Horn/320 Ranch area thereby reducing user interactions and possible conflicts.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5 to provide quality motorized single track riding on a historically used route. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to provide quiet non-motorized recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat.
Larry Ellison	Bitterroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Reopen the Onion Basin # 34 to Eaglehead. Nice view, nice ride, and the best access to Eaglehead Mtn.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5 to provide quality motorized single track riding on a historically used route. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to provide quiet non-motorized recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat.
Paul Herbel		927	Bozeman	Onion Basin trail #34 needs to be opened. It takes bikes off the trail into Ramshorn Lane and diverts them up to Eaglehead Mtn. It also provides a loop opportunity while dispersing user groups. It provides an additional exit off the crest should weather or an emergency dictate. Tepee Creek needs to stay	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5 to provide quality motorized single track riding on a historically used route. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				open. I often opt to ride from here to Ramshorn Lake to avoid other groups from Big Sky. It is the furthest access point from Bozeman but provides disbursement of trail users. Cinnamon Basin needs all those trails to open and close on the same dates for continuity and reduce confusion.		motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to provide quiet non-motorized recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat. Tepee Ck. Trail would be closed to motorized use in the preferred alternative for the same reasons. The Trails in Cinnamon Basin would all open and close to motorcycles on the same dates (trails would be open from July 15 - Dec. 2)
Pete Rugheimer		1520		We discussed keeping the small section of the Crest trail above Onion Basin open to prevent motorcyclists from having to drop down into the lower more populated trails around the Buffalo Horn/320 Ranch area thereby reducing user interactions and possible conflicts.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5 to provide quality motorized single track riding on a historically used route. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to provide quiet non-motorized recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat.
Todd Orr		840		39 - Teepee Creek - Another rewarding motorcycle loop with less horse use than Buffalo Horn Trail 1. Manage as is for motorcycle use.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5 to provide quality motorized single track riding on a historically used route. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to provide quiet non-motorized recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat. Tepee Ck. Trail would be closed to motorized use in the preferred alternative for the same reasons.
Todd Orr		840		95 - Dailey Creek Spur - Proper signing with motorized closures at Yellowstone Park Boundary a must.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	We agree.
Todd Orr		840		100 - Daily Pass Cutoff - Proper signing with motorized closures at Yellowstone Park Boundary a must.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	We agree.
Todd Orr		840		296 - Buffalo Horn Pass - Proper signing with motorized closures at Yellowstone Park Boundary a must.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	We agree.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Todd Orr		840		34 - Onion Basin - Manage as is for motorcycle use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5 to provide quality motorized single track riding on a historically used route. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction (including Onion Basin) to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to provide quiet non-motorized recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat.
Todd Orr		840		96 - Crest trail north of 34 to 82 - Manage as is for motorcycle use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5 to provide quality motorized single track riding on a historically used route. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to provide quiet non-motorized recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat.
Todd Orr		840		299 - Porcupine/Rock Divide - Manage as is for motorcycle use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5 to provide quality motorized single track riding on a historically used route. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to provide quiet non-motorized recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat.
Todd Orr		840		423 - Blackmore - Suggest keeping open to motorcycle or implement alternating day motorcycle use to reduce possible conflicts and satisfy both non and motorized groups. Well-signed trailhead with alternating day motorized explanation is necessary (suggest constructing a short connection to Blackmore trail 423, from the Window Rock Cabin trail. If desired, this would allow for a motorized access that could bypass the lower section of	Hyalite	In Alt 7M, Blackmore Trail #423 would be closed to motorized use to provide a high elevation non motorized recreation opportunity in Hyalite drainage. This would be the only high elevation trail in the drainage exclusive to hiking and stock use.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Blackmore trail, which experiences the highest non-motorized use. The lower section of 523 could then be a non-motorized access and route. If connection was made, it would require the alternating-day motorized use signing.		
Todd Orr		840		Window Rock Cabin Trail - suggest constructing this short connection to Blackmore trail 423 and manage for motorcycle use. This would allow for a motorcycle access that could bypass the lower section of Blackmore trail 523, which experiences the highest non-motorized use. Thus, the lower section of 523 could be non-motorized access with fewer user-conflicts. If connection was made, it would require the alternating day motorcycle use signing.	Hyalite	In Alt 7M, Blackmore Trail #423 would be closed to motorized use to provide a high elevation non motorized recreation opportunity in Hyalite drainage. This would be the only high elevation trail in the drainage exclusive to hiking and stock use.
Ryan Tripp		170	Bozeman	I would hate to see the Blackmore Peak trailhead closed to motorcycles due to the fact that is one of the most challenging and majestic rides of the many places we are being allowed to ride.	Gallatin Crest	In Alt 7M, Blackmore Trail #423 would be closed to motorized use to provide a high elevation non motorized recreation opportunity in Hyalite drainage. This would be the only high elevation trail in the drainage exclusive to hiking and stock use.
Todd Orr		840		415 - Blackmore Peak: manage as trail 423. Topography prevents any motorized extension of trail.	Gallatin Crest	In Alt 7M, Blackmore Trail #423 would be closed to motorized use to provide a high elevation non motorized recreation opportunity in Hyalite drainage. This would be the only high elevation trail in the drainage exclusive to hiking and stock use.
Patti Steinmuller		1132		Golden Trout Lakes, Eaglehead Mountain, and Windy Pass. I would like the FS to reconsider motorcycle use of this trail. I think that it is inappropriate to allow motorcycle access on this trail because of existing trail damage, the potential for greater damage with increased use, and potential conflicts with non-motorized users, especially from the high-powered machines that are ridden today.	Gallatin Crest	In Alt 7M, Golden Trout Lakes, Eaglehead Mountain, and Windy Pass trails would all be closed to motorcycle use.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Other time-sharing options that should be strongly considered for the final plan are time sharing of horse and pedestrian use of the Lava Lake Trail, rather than excluding horse use entirely, and time sharing of mountain bike and pedestrian use of the Emerald and Hyalite Lake Trails.	Lee Metcalf Spanish Peaks	In Alt 7M, the Lava Lake trail would be closed to stock use due to safety concerns with heavy pedestrian traffic and lack of adequate stock containment areas around the lake. Management of the Lava Lake Trail is a difficult and evolving decision, please see the Record of Decision for the final information on this route. Your suggestion of "time share" on Heather Emerald is being considered. Please see the ROD for the final discussion on time share trails close to Bozeman.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Rich Inman et al	Gallatin Valley Back Country Horsemen	428a		Lava Lake Trail - we are opposed to year long closure of this trail. It is part of a loop route between Lava Lake and Deer Lake that is suited to stock use and has been used by stock for decades. This trail receives considerable stock use during hunting season. Who determined and what factors were used to now declare this "not suited for stock use"? We would like you to share with us the qualifications of this determining person(s) as we know that most people on staff for the Gallatin Forest are not experienced horsemen. We recommend an even/odd day use system that hikers and stock users can share. Another option is to designate hiker use on Friday through Sunday and stock users Monday through Thursday except for spring bear and fall hunting season during which time it would be shared every day. We ask that your Bozeman District Ranger show us the unacceptable damage so we can discuss possible remedial actions as opposed to closing it to stock.	Lee Metcalf Spanish Peaks	In Alt 7M, the Lava Lake trail would be closed to stock use due to safety concerns with heavy pedestrian traffic and lack of adequate stock containment areas around the lake. This is a difficult and evolving decision, please see the Record of Decision for the final information on this route.
Russ Pool		1783		The Lava Lake Trail has poor trailer access and it is used extensively by day hikers and I understand why stock use should be limited.	Lee Metcalf Spanish Peaks	In Alt 7M, the Lava Lake trail would be closed to stock use due to safety concerns with heavy pedestrian traffic and lack of adequate stock containment areas around the lake. Please see the Record of Decision for the final information on this route.
Todd Hoitsma		1340		Corbly Creek: wet meadows have been tracked with dirt bikes. Dirt bikers cannot just skip over wet areas on rocks, they go right through them leaving their tracks and bare ground/erosion.	West Bridgers North	In Alt 7M, Limestone trail #544 would be restricted to motorcycle use only. All motorized trails would be identified on the travel plan map. Motorized use would only be allowed on designated trails. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		A couple examples of where timing restrictions would be especially useful are Blackmore Trail #423, History Rock Trail #424, Trails #427 and 434.	Hyalite	In Alt 7M, no ATV use would be allowed, nor motorized use on trail # 424 and #423. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Jon Schwedler		1126		It is my hope that restrictions on motorized traffic during hunting season can be implemented in Corbly	West Bridgers North	In Alt 7M, the Corbly Gulch trail would be managed for motorcycles between June 15 and October 15. The

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Gulch. I often begin hunts from here and the elk are driven further up into the hills due to motorized use.		remainder of the year the trail would be non-motorized. ATVs would be restricted from Corbly Gulch year round. Additionally, this trail is being considered for "time shared" management where during the open season, motorized use would be prohibited on certain days of the week to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on "time shared" trails.
Randy Wold		1625		All motorized vehicles be kept out of N. Cottonwood drainage, summer and winter and don't build the N. Cottonwood Johnson connect trail. There is already substantial recreation usage of the canyon. There is even a permanent structure built at the head of the drainage where kids camp overnight and ski, complete with journal, cooking gear, wood stove, stored food, etc. Probably sleeps 8 people. This structure should be removed.	West Bridgers North	In Alt 7M, North Cottonwood drainage would be closed to all motorized use. The proposed Johnson Connector trail would be managed for non-motorized uses only in Alternative 7M. We were not aware of the unauthorized structure. The Bozeman District Ranger will follow up and employ law enforcement measures as appropriate.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	The proposal to exclude motor vehicles for North Cottonwood Trail (#545) is great as this trail is unsuitable to vehicle traffic, being very rocky in the lower reaches and very soft and muddy in the upper reaches.	West Bridgers North	In Alt 7M, North Cottonwood Trail #545 would be closed to all motorized use.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The North Cottonwood trail (545) is a rocky single track trail that seems to disappear somewhere on section 16 or 21. I do not object to closing it to motorcycles if the trails (500, 551, 534) in the Fairy Lake area and the Limestone/Corbly trail (544) are left open to motorcycles. The Corbly trail is a very difficult, technical single track challenge. The remaining roads should be left open to motorized use.	West Bridgers North	In Alt 7M, North Cottonwood Trail #545 would be closed to motorized use. The relocated S Fork Road allows access to Ross Peak and Trail 534 will allow motorcycles to travel to the west side of the Bridgers and onto the Foothills trail system north of Middle Cottonwood. There will be motorcycle access to Ross pass via a new connector trail. Trails #500 and 551 would remain open to motorcycles and the Fairy Lake trail (trail #500) would also be an ATV opportunity to Fairy Lake.
Alexis Goodyear		52	Belgrade	We have 2 children that both enjoy snowmobiling up Hyalite; Taylor Fork and Buck Ridge, just to name a few. I feel that these trails are important to my family, other families. We all use the forest.	Snowmobiles	In Alt 7M, portions of Hyalite would remain open to snowmobile opportunities. Buck Ridge and Taylor Fork areas would remain open as currently managed. Refer to the ROD for the final decision and rationale for it.
Joe Cashman		43		Leave Buffalo Horn Portal, Hyalite, and the Bridgers open to snow machines so people can enjoy these areas without impacting them.	Snowmobiles	In Alt 7M, portions of Hyalite would remain open to snowmobile opportunities. Buffalo Horn and Portal Creek areas would remain open as currently managed. Opportunities in the Bridgers would be less restricted in Alt 7M from 7 but still protect wildlife habitat and allow for snowmobile use.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Joe Cashman		43		We need to keep Hyalite, Bridgers and Windy Pass open to provide these 1/2 day experiences.	Snowmobiles	In Alt 7M, portions of Hyalite would remain open to snowmobile opportunities. Opportunities in the Windy Pass area and in the Bridgers would be less restricted in Alt 7M as compared to Alt 7. Refer to the ROD for the final decision and rationale for it.
Mary Sadowski		773		I fully support the M. Sypes Canyon, North Cottonwood and Mineshaft trails as non-motorized and ask that you designate Middle Cottonwood, Truman and Corbly Gulch as non-motorized as well.	West Bridger South	In Alt 7M, the "M", Sypes Canyon, North Cottonwood, and Shaft House trail would be closed to all motorized use. Middle Cottonwood, Truman and Limestone trail #544 would be open to motorcycle use in Alt 7M. Staggered use would be considered for Middle Cottonwood to the Saddle Peak divide. The Forest would develop staggered use timing after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups. Please see the ROD for the final discussion on time shared trails.
Todd Orr		840		83 - Golden Trout Lakes - Suggest closing 83 to all motorized use due to high non motorized traffic. This leaves the Windy Pass/Golden Trout Lakes trailhead non motorized and reduces many possible conflicts. Alternate routes could be available for motorized access from Portal Creek to the Crest via 187 and to Porcupine via 66.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	In Alt 7M The Windy Pass Trail and Golden Trout Lake Trail would be managed for non-motorized uses. Trail #194 would provide motorcycle access to Porcupine via trail 66 in this alternative.
Loren Blanksma		1194		I do not object to closing the Elkhorn Ridge trail and some other North Bridger trails (520, 521, 523, 5234, 529) to motorcycles because of the access issues. I do however object to closing Horsethief trail because this is a good trail opportunity in an area that has no other trails and is hardly used at all by non-motorized users. The remaining road system should remain open to motorized use.	North Bridgers	In Alt 7M, the North Bridgers would be managed to emphasize non motorized recreation use including pack and stock use. However some of the road system would remain open for motorized opportunities.
Todd Orr		840		Porcupine Cutoff - If motorcycle travel on the lower Porcupine trail 34 was undesirable, I suggest managing this cutoff trail as the motorcycle trail access into upper Porcupine or to 199 Elkhorn Ridge, while allowing the lower 2 miles of trail 34 to be managed for horse and foot travel only. Would need to connect the user-made trail in section 16 (see GPS) to this trail, however.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	In Alt 7M, this portion of Trail #34 would remain open to motorcycle use.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Keep Moose to Windy Pass #187 open for motorcycle use. Motorcycle are the only users I have ever seen on this trail. There is evidence of occasional horse use. It is fun, challenging ride. I usually camp on Moose Creek and Don't want ride	Gallatin Crest	In Alt 7M, this trail would remain open to current uses, including motorcycles.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the road to portal Creek to access Windy Pass. It seems to me that there is no conflict here anyway.		
Loren Blanksma		1194		I also support Alt 7 plans to leave Gallatin Crest (96), Windy Pass (82), Squaw Creek (185) and Swan Creek (186) open to motorcycle use.	Gallatin Crest	In Alt 7M, these trails, except Trail #82 (Windy Pass) would remain open to current uses, including motorcycles. Access to the Crest from Portal Creek would be from Trail #187, the Moose Creek Trail, and Windy Pass would be managed for foot and stock travel.
Patricia Brandon		739		Squaw Creek 186 affords opportunity to ride and not return by the same route. This is very important on a ride to not have to go and return the same route.	Gallatin Crest	In Alt 7M, this trail would remain open to current uses, including motorcycles. Loop opportunities would remain.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The Tamphery Creek trail should remain a motorcycle opportunity. This trail (187) is a technical single track that appear to not receive much hiker traffic. The Squaw Creek Ridge Trail (417) also receives very little hiker use and thus motorcycle travel should remain the same as the current plan.	Gallatin Crest	In Alt 7M, trail #187 would remain open to current uses, including motorcycles. A portion of Trail #417would be remain open to motorized use creating a loop opportunity. The portion of #417 leading into South Cottonwood would be closed to motorized use to prevent illegal use.
Loren Blanksma		1194		I do not object to closing the Bear Lakes trail #53 from Bear Lakes to the Bozeman Creek Divide, but the Chestnut Mountain trail (458) should remain open to motorcycles. This is a relatively short ridge trail (458) that has very low impact on wildlife.	Bear Canyon	In Alt 7M, Trail #53 west of Bear Lake would remain closed to motorized use. The Chestnut Mountain Trail #458 would be closed to motorized use to protect an important wildlife migration corridor, and provide a non-motorized recreation opportunity in the Bear Canyon area.
Jeannie Wall		990	Bozeman	Close Leverich Canyon to motorized use. It is my backyard. I run there every week and it is a narrow trail getting trashed by motorbikes.	Motorized (General)	In Alternative 7-M Leverich Canyon would be managed for non-motorized uses.
Todd Orr		840		8 - West Buck Ridge/McAtee Basin - Suggest heavy signing and manage as closed to motorized use beyond the Third Yellow Mule to secure a remote trail experience for hikers and hunters while preventing a motorized access to the Wilderness.	Big Sky	In Alternative 7-M summer motorized use would be closed beyond the third Yellowmule on trail 8 (Inspiration Trail). This is currently the way that trail system is being managed and there was no compelling resource reason to change this recreational use pattern in the preferred alternative (Alternative 7-M).
Doug Ferris		910	Silvergate	Leave the Cooke City trails where they are. No restricting dates, no more closures and reopen what has been closed. Our economy depends on the use of motorization.	Cooke City	In Alternative 7M the Forest Service proposes to manage motorized recreation activities pretty much status quo. In Alternative 7M, seasonal restrictions are proposed to remain a District Ranger decision on a case-by-case basis rather than a blanket seasonal restriction.
Trish Kerby		145		Trails to Moccasin Lake via Dry Creek please try to keep this area open for ATVs- ever fix the road or open it up for 4X4s. By the bridge getting over the East Boulder so we can continue going there.		In Alternative 7-M the Picket Pin Road (FR#140) is proposed to be open to full-size vehicles; the existing mining roads on the East Boulder Plateau are proposed to be open to ATV's; and the Graham Creek Trail #117, and Blacktail Creek Trail #20 are proposed to be open to motorcycles. The Dry Fork Road is proposed to be open

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						to full size vehicles to where the road becomes a trail on the east side of Section 7, then is open to ATV's to a point just west of Moccasin Lake where the trail becomes single track, and then open to motorcycles to its' junction with Trail #2. This provides the widest range of recreational opportunities given the capability of the resources.
Earl McNinch		293		The creation of a new loop joining the Sheep Mountain Road in the Henderson Mountain Road is ill advised, it would open a beautiful easy to hike area to potential motorized abuse. Creating loops only invites riding for riding sake type of motorized usage.	Cooke City	In Alternative 7M, a short ATV connector route is proposed to connect the Henderson Mountain saddle with the Henderson Mountain Road. If selected as part of Alternative 7M, prior to construction, the Forest Service will prepare an environmental analysis and the public will have additional opportunities to comment on the proposal.
Judy A. Rue	Sweet Grass County Recreation Association	1123		Keep all of the Derby Ridge #126 open. This trail needs to remain open as it is one of the most challenging in the area.		In Alternative 7-M, Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail.
Thomas Pick		329		Fairy Lake area: through roaded areas between the Southfork of Carroll Creek to Frazier Creek, and over to the South Fork of Flathead Creek appear to be planned for nonmotorized use which I believe is highly desirable due to the past harvest activities and the lack of much suitable cover for big game. This area has been a zoo in the past during the big-game season (archery and rifle).	Fairy Lake	In Alternative 7-M, the Carroll Creek road (FSR 75) would be a summer motorized opportunity for ATV's and motorcycles and ties into Benchmark road (FSR 6984) to Flathead Pass road. Alt 7M would allow that use from approx. June 15 - December 1. ROD is going to set the dates? Travel is already restricted to designated routes only and does not allow for game retrieval. There were no compelling resource reasons to close this route to motorized use in the preferred alternative (Alternative 7-M).
Nellie Isreal	Beartooth Alliance	669		We urge the FS to re-evaluate the opening date for road use. While we strongly discourage use of roads still soft and wet from winter snow, we believe that a July 1 date would be environmentally acceptable most years. When that is not the case, the roads could be closed temporarily until they area dried and hardened.	Cooke City	In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service will consider making determinations of whether or not to seasonally restrict a road or trail, on a case-by-case basis at the ranger district level. We agree that roads and trails can be temporarily restricted during wet or late snow years as needed.
Earl McNinch		293		Goose Lake Jeep Trail: keep it open. This Jeep Trail provides access to multiple trailheads, lakes,	Cooke City	In no alternative does the Forest Service propose to close the entire Goose Lake Jeep Road. In Alternative 7

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				streams, mountains and drainages. All nondesignated OHV user made side roads and trails should be closed, blocked and signed. This jeep road is part of the area's history and provides access to the backcountry for all and for folks who can no longer hide the 6 miles in and 6 miles out in addition to their final destination.		the last mile or so of the jeep road would be closed as mitigation for adding ATV loop opportunities in the Tradenic area. An additional mile (as opposed to 6 miles) would be added to a hike to Goose Lake in this alternative. No other trailheads would be affected. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service does not propose to close any portion of the jeep road.
Loren Blanksma		1194		I do object to closing the only remaining short single track motorized trails in this area (Bear Creek 364, Palmer Creek 67). These trails are the only two short motorized single track loop opportunities in an area surrounded by the non-motorized AB wilderness.	Gardiner Basin	In order to reduce encroachments by motorized vehicles into the wilderness in Alternative 7M the Forest Service proposes to close to motorized vehicles, all trails leading into wilderness.
Dean and Madelein Bladow		1191	Cooke City	We oppose new ATV trails connecting Henderson Mountain Road # 3223 with Daisy Pass. We do not encourage or support creating any loops which may serve "4-wheeling" as a sport rather than serving as transportation to trail heads, vistas, or lakes for the enjoyment of natural features.	Cooke City	Interesting thoughts. It is generally accepted in the motorized community that loops provide a better recreation opportunity than point-to-point routes. By continuing to show a loop opportunity from Henderson Mountain overlook to Henderson Mountain Road #3223, the opportunity will remain for pursuing construction of this short connector ATV route, sometime in the future. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service does not propose to connect the Henderson Mountain Road (#3223) with the Fisher Mountain Road near Daisy Pass. It is not cost effective (from maintenance and safety aspects) to consider such a connector.
Greg Beardslee		737		The Lower M-Trail: This is where bicyclists will have to walk their bikes until past the foothills trail junction. How about some education signage for the hikers and bikers?	West Bridgers South	In the Preferred Alternative, the Bridger Foothills Trail #534 would remain open to mountain bike use. Trails #511, 512, 513 accessing the "M" monument would be closed to mountain bike use. Mountain bikers would be encouraged, but not mandated to walk their bikes on trail #534 (especially going downhill). Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Todd Orr		840		2 - Red Mountain Ridge north of 108 - Suggest managing as is - open to motorcycle use, to complete a loop in West Fork Upper Deer Creek. A great technical and challenging ride with little to no stock or foot use and low conflicts.		It appears the commenter is referring to the Boone's Peak Driveway Trail, which is proposed to be open to motorcycles under Alternative 7-M.
Noreen Breeding		1823		Excluding motorcycles from all trails leaving the trailhead at Tom Miner Basin Campground will also improve conditions for campers.	Tom Miner Rock	It is debatable as to whether or not conditions would improve if the camper was planning to use motorcycles as a recreation pursuit.
Paul and Gaye Kloster		1369	Cooke City	Fishermen created the so called "unauthorized trail" to Corner Lake. Closing it effectively closes the slate to fishing, as areas no place to park a vehicle along	Cooke City	It is less than 1000 feet to Corner Lake from the Goose Lake Jeep Road. People have driven their vehicles closer and closer to the lakeshore and as a result the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				this road. Moreover, the area covered by this short trail is so miniscule as to be insignificant. Similarly, closing the Goose Lake Trail effectively closes a dozen or more lakes to reasonable access.		lakeside plant community has been impacted. In order to protect the fragile lakeshore around Corner Lake we recommend no change to the current travel plan designation. The Forest Service has no jurisdiction over whether or not a lake is open or closed to fishing. We can create a parking area adjacent to Goose Lake Jeep Road if it is needed. In no alternatives does the Forest Service propose a complete closure of the Goose Lake Road, only the last 1 mile or so.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		In accordance with the Crow people's rights to sacred ground, and in keeping with the National Historic Preservation Act as it pertains to native peoples' cultural and spiritual claims, the FS must recognize that permitting OHV use of any kind anywhere in the Crazy Mountains is a violation of The Mountain as sacred ground to the Crow people. We strongly support this tenet as the driving principle for travel plan decisions in the Crazy Mountains.	East Crazies	It is our opinion that we have applied this same tenet as a driving principal in our travel planning efforts in the Crazy Mountains. However, as public land with multiple public interests and historical uses, and a checkerboard ownership of private and federal lands, the application of this tenet is complicated. GNF has applied the tenet of 'non-motorized use of the Crazies' as preferable to the Apsaalooke/Crow people or at least the traditionalists. However, as each area has been analyzed and deviations from that tenet were under consideration, it was our opinion that Crow elders and traditionalist were the best spokesmen for the high priority areas to be protected and how best to assess compromises. GNF has worked closely and continuously with the Tribal Council's delegated Cultural Committee on the design of the Travel Plan as it is finally presented in 7-M.
Judy A. Rue	Sweet Grass County Recreation Association	1123		Keep all of Deer Creek #5 open. This trail is a vital access route to the Deer Creek cabin, Wepler Cabin and the CNF.		Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 from the its' junction with Trail #156 to its' junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 will be open to motorcycles to provide a motorcycle loop connection with the Red Mountain Trail #156, and because of the number of creek crossing in this area that will be cheaper and less impactive to harden for motorcycle use as opposed to ATV use. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be open to ATV's from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use
Craig Kenworthy		938	Bozeman	Middle Cottonwood and Truman Gulch should not be opened to motorcycles. They do not have significant	West Bridgers South	Middle Cottonwood Trail #586 and Truman Gulch trail #535 are currently open to motorcycle use. It would

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				elevation gain in the first mile. That makes them an excellent choice to take people who are visiting the area for an easy hike.		remain open to motorcycle use in Alt 7M. The season of use would be more restrictive in Alt 7M. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Loren Blanksma		1194		In addition, the Truman Gulch and Middle Cottonwood should remain open to motorcycles.	West Bridgers South	Middle Cottonwood Trail #586 and Truman Gulch trail #535 are currently open to motorcycle use. They would remain open to motorcycle use in Alt 7M.
Brett Baker		1173		Strongly request that the Middle Cottonwood area be closed to Motorized traffic, we are very much aware the trail is within the riparian zone of the year round stream for almost the entire length of the trail. It is very well know that motorized traffic, causing both disruption of wildlife corridors and damage to the delicate riparian zone habitats, are very disruptive to both wildlife and it's supportive habitat. The Middle Cottonwood trail is a very narrow trail, which narrowly allow hikers to pass each other in places. Much destructive work to the trail would have to be done to allow the motorized traffic to pass hikers and horse traffic safely.	West Bridgers South	Middle Cottonwood Trail #586 is currently open to motorcycle use and would remain open in Alt 7M however seasonal restrictions would apply. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Danelle Cary		1058	Billings	Allowing motorized vehicles would destroy the terrain, and the peacefulness. I saw several families and older people walking the trails. Allowing motor vehicles would jeopardize their safety. Please don't allow motorized vehicles in the Middle Fork of Cottonwood Creek.	West Bridgers South	Middle Cottonwood Trail #586 is currently open to motorcycle use. It would remain open to motorcycle use in Alt 7M. The season of use would be more restrictive in Alt 7M. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
David Pierce		960		Middle Cottonwood is a heavily used trail by hikers of all ages. By making Middle Cottonwood a motorized access you will be pushing hikers onto the already overcrowded Sypes and M trails. Middle Cottonwood has many blind corners where even the most considerate of motorized users cannot see hikers, children and dogs coming.	West Bridgers South	Middle Cottonwood Trail #586 is currently open to motorcycle use. It would remain open to motorcycle use in Alt 7M. The season of use would be more restrictive in Alt 7M. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Fred Opperman		232	Bozeman	Allowing motorcycles in the Bridger on trails like Middle Cotton, Corbly and Truman Gulch again will be spreading noxious weeds and defacing the fragile habitat along the Bridger Crest.	West Bridgers South	Middle Cottonwood Trail #586 is currently open to motorcycle use. It would remain open to motorcycle use in Alt 7M. The season of use would be more restrictive in Alt 7M. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Martin and Lanette Dowd		1007	Belgrade	We do not want to see Middle Cottonwood, Truman Gulch and Corbly Gulch open to motorcycles. We enjoy the wildlife, scenery and solitude. We don't	West Bridgers South	Middle Cottonwood Trail #586, Limestone Trail #534, and Truman Gulch trail #535 are currently open to motorcycle use. They would remain open to motorcycle

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				want to see that spoiled by allowing motorized use. The noise and fumes from any type of motorized use reach a hiker/skier long before and long after the vehicle has passed.		use in Alt 7M. The season of use would be more restrictive in Alt 7M than it is currently. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Lauri McCommon		521	Bozeman	I spend a lot of time in the Bridger Mtns. And have hiked on all the trails there numerous times, both in the winter and summer months. These are very popular trails and I support designating the M, Sypes Canyon, No. Cottonwood, Middle Cottonwood, Truman Gulch and Corbly Creek as non-motorized. In the Spring, these trails have a lot of water on them from the run-off and there is damage from the ATV's in the mud. They are also very foot-traveled trails and have the potential for serious vehicle-human encounters from motorized users racing down the narrow trails.	West Bridgers South	Middle Cottonwood Trail #586, Limestone Trail #534, and Truman Gulch trail #535 are currently open to motorcycle use. They would remain open to motorcycle use in Alt 7M. The season of use would be more restrictive in Alt 7M than it is currently. Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance. Sypes #531 trail is managed for non motorized recreational use. It would continue to offer these non motorized opportunities in Alt 7M. The "M" trail system would be closed to all uses except hiking. North Cottonwood would be closed to motorized in Alt 7M. No ATV use would be allowed in the West Bridger South Travel Planning Area in Alt 7M.
Kirk Astroth	4-H Center for Youth Development, MSU	878	Bozeman	I encourage planning that preserves as much area as possible from motorized access which rapidly degrades the soil and vegetation in the Middle Cottonwood, Truman and Corbly Gulch areas.	West Bridgers South	Middle Cottonwood Trail #586, Limestone Trail #544, and Truman Gulch trail #535 are currently open to motorcycle use. They would remain open to motorcycle use in Alt 7M. The season of use would be more restrictive in Alt 7M than it is currently. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Middle Fork Upper Deer Creek 112: without motorcycle use on this trail it would become so overgrown and undefined that it would be hard to find and follow. It also creates a great connection trail between trails 2 and 108 and provides another looping opportunity.		Middle Fork #112 is proposed to be open to motorcycles in Alternative 7-M.
Judy A. Rue	Sweet Grass County Recreation Association	1123		Keep all of the Middle Fork #121 trail open. This adds a nice alternative to the longer loop and would not make any sense to close as it is a well established trail.		Middle Fork #112 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.
John and Carole Oldemeyer		839		We are opposed to the Huckleberry Lake ATV loop. We believe that creating this loop would have the potential for creating a "race track" for extreme ATV users and would cross wetlands. That is not an appropriate use of this area.	Cooke City	Most people have spoken out against this proposed loop opportunity. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service does not propose to create a loop opportunity near Huckleberry Lake.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Windy Pass Trail #82 and Swan Creek Trail #186: like the Gallatin Crest Trail, traverse a fragile areas that cannot withstand repeated motorcycle use. Closing the Windy Pass Trail to motorcycles on weekends is a small step in the right direction, but will not be effective in limiting the damage to the trail and area. Both trail should be motor free. What is the Forest Service planning to do to restore these damage trails and prevent future damage?	Gallatin Crest	Motorcycle use of the Gallatin Crest trail system is an existing use and popular motorized use. In Alt 7M Windy Pass trail would become non motorized due to high use. An alternate motorcycle route would be developed to the crest from trail #187. Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Gary Weiner		995	Bozeman	I support non-motorized for Emerald and Hyalite Lake trails - too crowded w/ day hikers. The mtn bikes I've encountered have been responsible and courteous. I'm not convinced they need to be banned.	Gallatin Crest	Motorized use and mountain bike use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the Forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be addressed through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Noreen Breeding		1004	Bozeman	Foot travel needs to be separated from mechanized travel. On Emerald Lake, Hyalite Lake and South Cottonwood trails I have been sideswiped by bicycles speeding past from behind me.	Non-Motorized (General)	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use on East Fork and Hyalite trails. To begin to deal with user conflicts on this trail, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Carol Weaver		993	Bozeman	No motorized on the Gallatin Divide. When I was up there I saw a motorcycle which couldn't make the turns through the rocks and fell over and spilled gas. No motorized up Emerald and Heather Lakes. The land is too fragile. I have seen motorcycles go off trail and just tear up the meadow right after the upper bridge in early summer.	Gallatin Crest	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. Gallatin Divide Trail receives low use. Alt 7M would restrict season of use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (Refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Abigail Breuer		893	Bozeman	I would ask that non-motorized recreation be the emphasis on several trails: Bridger Foothills, Middle Cottonwood, Truman and Corbly. Given the amount of use by non-motorized users I hope the FS will preserve quiet recreation opportunities.	West Bridgers South	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. In Alt 7M, motorcycle use would continue on trails #586, 535, 544. Bridger Foothill Trail #534 would be closed to motorized use south of Middle Cottonwood and north of Limestone trails. The season of use would be more restrictive in Alt 7M. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Michael Carden		1225	Bozeman	Close Emerald Lake trail to skier's one year and let snowmobilers ride up there and give the skier's the Hyalite Lake trail system, then the next year alternate.	Hyalite	The preferred alternative would manage Heather/Emerald as open to snowmobiles. However, winter management in the Hyalite area is a challenging balance, and discussions are ongoing. Please see the Record of Decision, and the winter Decision Maps for the final configuration of winter uses in Hyalite. No alternative is currently considering "time shared" uses in the winter time, though this is being considered for summer motorized uses. Again, please see the ROD for the final decision relative to time shared uses.
Greg Beardslee		737	Bozeman	The trails to Emerald lake and Hyalite Lake do need controls because of some weekend overuse. Education may work; even -- odd days or some day of week schedule may be next. I purposely try to avoid weekend use some both of these trails, but because of the access nature of the Hyalite trail, sometimes it cannot be avoided when riding from the Gallatin Crest or Squaw, and passing through Hyalite on the way back to town.	Gallatin Crest	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the Forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be addressed through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Alaina Lammer Knight		629		Do not allow motorized traffic on the Hyalite Lake and Emerald Lake Trails. It is not compatible with the current volume of hikers, bikers and horseback riders. User conflict is a serious threat.	Gallatin Crest	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (Refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Amanda Carter		132	Bozeman	I'm very opposed to the motorized use on Hyalite and Emerald Lake trails. They are steep with many switchbacks and tundra which is fragile. People can still have access to the Crest trail from Squaw creek which doesn't have the foot traffic.	Gallatin Crest	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (Refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 434 - Emerald - Heather - Motorized - Summer and winter - leave open - This is a great area with lakes, viewing, fishing, camping, bikes, horseback riding, beautiful view for all.	Gallatin Crest	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (Refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Corey Biggers		93	Bozeman	Emerald and Heather is a post card mountain bike ride. It is one of the best trails I have ever ridden on a bike. Upper Hyalite Lake trail is a great ride by itself but when you put it together with Squaw or Swan Creeks and use it as a loop out it becomes extraordinary.	Gallatin Crest	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (Refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance. The Squaw/Swan Loop would remain open to motorized use in Alternative 7-M.
Jennifer Swearingen		983	Bozeman	Designate Emerald Land and the Gallatin Crest as non-motorized. My family and I have been forced off the trail by inconsiderate users of motorcycles. We have seen the trash and destruction left in their wake.	Gallatin Crest	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the Forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644	Bozeman	Do not allow motorized traffic on the Hyalite Lake and Emerald Lake trails. It is not compatible with the current volume of hikers, bikers and horseback riders. User conflict is a serious threat.	Gallatin Crest	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the Forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Catherine Weeden		1604		Numerous short dead-end user made jeep trails exist along the Langohr road. Some offer a campsite away from the road and likely will not be extended due to topography, while others should be signed and closed to motorized use to prevent possible resource	Hyalite	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
David Chambers		1059	Bozeman	Hyalite Creek/Lake Trail: This is a narrow foot trail that passes by a dozen waterfalls on the way to Hyalite Lake. This is not an appropriate place to be riding these motorcycles.	Hyalite	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Greg Beardslee		737	Bozeman	The trails to Emerald Lake and Hyalite Lake do need controls because of some weekend overuse.	Hyalite	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Education may work; even-odd days or some day of week schedule may be next.		staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Jeff Thompson		1581	Bozeman	I am concerned about the potential closure of the Emerald Lake trail to mnt. Bikers. If the reason for closure is based upon conflicting uses I would suggest restricted mountain bikers to using the trail on odd numbered days of the month and horse back riders restricted to using the trail on even numbered days of the month.	Hyalite	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Kerry White		1616		As for mountain bikes and motorized in the summer, a solution may be to rotate use back and forth, year to year, to accommodate maintenance and lessen resource damage.	Hyalite	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1191	Bozeman	Keep Hyalite #427 open. Some people that ride the Crest like to return to Bozeman This way.	Hyalite	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Keep Emerald and heather #434 open. This provides motorized access to lakes. Both are also convenient to Bozeman for a day trip.	Hyalite	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Kay Van Norman		1033		While riding up to Emerald and Heather Lakes last week I noticed a significant amount of damage just since last year caused by short cutting trails. There were no horse tracks or bike tracks on those shortcuts, just foot prints. I am not a motorized user	Gallatin Crest	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest would implement staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups. Resource damage would

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				but am uncomfortable that motorized users have been vilified in this process.		be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		East Fork Hyalite 434: some sort of time, daily, seasonal, alternating weeks or days, types of restrictions may be acceptable but total closure is not	Gallatin Crest	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest would implement staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups. Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Hyalite trail for 427: this trail is of the utmost importance for continued motorized single-track use. It connects to the Gallatin Crest and Squaw Pass therefore being very valuable as a link to other areas. Some compromise of time or date restrictions must be accomplished to keep this trail from total closure.	Gallatin Crest	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest would implement staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups. Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The Hyalite trail (427) is one of the most beautiful trails that I have ever ridden, and alternating day use between motorized and non-motorized would be acceptable to maintain sustainable multiple use.	Gallatin Crest	Motorized use on these trails is an existing use. To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest would implement staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups. Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Todd Orr		840		171 Lost Trail (East of Palisade Falls) - Suggest keeping open to motorcycles. Very little use by foot and horse due to lack of trailhead signs, parking and trail maintenance. Leave undeveloped to secure remote trail experience. Topography prevents any motorized extension of trail.	Hyalite	In the preferred alternative 7M, trail 171 would be managed for non-motorized uses, to provide one of the only dedicated non-motorized trails in the Hyalite drainage.
Todd Orr		840		Garnet Mountain Lookout - Suggest managing as open to motorcycle or implement alternating-day motorcycle use to reduce possible conflicts and satisfy both non and motorized groups	Gallatin Roaded	Motorized use would remain the same from Rat Lake Trailhead to Garnet Mountain Lookout in Alternative 7-M. Trail #85 would be closed to motorized use.
George Reed, Jr.	Crow Tribe Executive Branch	806	Crow Agency, MT	…our sacred mountain where fasting quests have taken place in historic and pre-historic times. Time is of the essence if we want to protect and preserve our sacred mountain, the Bad Omen Mountain, from any disturbance, destruction, and desecration.	East Crazies	Mr. Reed was appointed as a delegate to Federal Agencies regarding Crow Cultural matters under the previous and current Tribal Chairman (10/1/01 and 2/27/03) as leader of the Crow Cultural Committee and Cabinet Head Cultural Affairs. He has led a group of elders and other interested Crow Traditionalists in

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						advising the GNF regarding Travel Planning. These comments are consistent with his advice from the beginning of our consultation. He has worked continuously with GNF advocating the greatest amount of protection for Bad Omen Mountain possible in this Travel Planning effort. Together we have identified the areas and settings deemed most important and GNF has sought his and his groups' advice on all the changes and adjustments made through the planning process, having attended 19 different meetings in which Travel Planning in the Crazies was discussed.
Roger Breeding		39		Hyalite Canyon - closing this area to snowmobiles and plowing the road is a great idea. This will open a large area of suitable terrain to X-C skiing and snowshoeing. As it is now, there are very few places close to town for these activities.	Hyalite	Alt 7M, a snowmobile route would be authorized, but the main emphasis of winter use in Hyalite Canyon would remain non motorized.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	Hood creek (#436) would make a good hiking trail, particularly because it connects with non-motorized trail # 462.	Hyalite	Alt 7M, a snowmobile route would be authorized, but the main emphasis of winter use in Hyalite Canyon would remain non motorized.
Ron Orton		1472b		For winter use I do not want Hyalite closed in the winter, it is a wonderful winter play ground for all to enjoy. Access by car is key in the early winter for skiing until snow is too deep. A ski up to Hyalite Lake is too long for a family outing. Plus, you are shutting down ice fishing and the blossoming sport of kite skiing. Hyalite Lake is an incredible place to kite ski.	Hyalite	Alt 7M, a snowmobile route would be authorized, but the main emphasis of winter use in Hyalite Canyon would remain non motorized.
John and Carole Oldemeyer		839		With regard to X-C Ski Trail South of Highway 212 - we support closure to snowmobiles except in the following cases: 1) the groomed snowmobile trail from the Cooke City dump to the FS slash dump near Cooke Pass. When some Highway Department begins plowing Highway 212 from Pilot Creek to Cooke City during winter, this will be the only direct access between Cooke City and Coulter Pass and from either community to the groomed Fisher Creek and Daisy Pass trails by snowmobile. This route is critical to the winter economy of businesses in both communities. 2) The road from Cooke City to the Irma Mine and Republic Pass trailhead.	Cooke City	Neither the groomed snowmobile trail from the Cooke City Compactor to the Forest Service slash dump nor the road from Cooke City to the Irma Mine has been proposed for closure to snowmobiles.
Dean and Madelein Bladow		1191	Cooke City	We are avid cross country skiers, thus, with regard to X-C ski trails south of Hwy 212, we support closure to snowmobiles except in the following cases: 1) The	Cooke City	None of the Travel Plan alternatives propose restricting snowmobile travel on 1) the Bannock Trail between Silver Gate and Cooke City; 2) the groomed snowmobile

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Bannock Trail system for Silver Gate to Cooke City should remain open to groomed snowmobile use. This trail is important access to Cooke City and Silver Gate for us and other winter residents of Bannock trail and Silver Gate. Closure would result in illegal snowmobile use of Hwy 212, the Banncok trail, and through private property between Silver Gate and Cooke City. 2) The groomed snowmobile trail from the Cooke City dump to the Forest Service slash dump near Cooke pass. When some highway Department begins plowing Hwy 212 from Pilot Creek to Cooke City during the winter, this will be the only direct access between Cooke City and Coulter Pass and from either community to the groomed Fisher Creek and Daisy Pass trails by snowmobile. This route is critical to winter economy of business in both communities of businesses in both communities. 3) The road from Cooke City to the Irma Mine and Republic Pass trailhead.		trail between the Cooke City dump and the Forest Service slash dump or 3) the Irma Mine Road.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Discussion about leaving trail #545 from Sacagawea Pk to Johnson Canyon open to motorcycles - this section of trail a very high priority for motorcyclists. This section of trail sees very little use from any other user group. Motorcyclists have historically cleaned and maintained this trail.	West Bridgers South	North Cottonwood is managed as non motorized. It would be closed to motorized in Alt 7M. The trail (#516) to the north to Johnson Canyon is a nonsystem trail and not maintained.
Joe Polus		1487		Leave Trail #545 from Sacagawea Pk to Johnson Canyon open to motorcycles. This section of trail is a very high priority for motorcyclists. This section of trail sees very little use from any other user group. Motorcyclists have historically cleaned and maintained this trail.	West Bridgers South	North Cottonwood is managed as non motorized. It would be closed to motorized use in Alt 7M. The trail (#516) to the north to Johnson Canyon is a nonsystem trail and not maintained.
Bob Donahoe		703		Corbly Gulch as well as all the other major drainages were used by prehistoric people for 10,000 years. Through our study we learned Corbly Gulch was a major travel way to the upper basins on the west side of the Bridgers. These upper basins are literally full of archeological remains; the Middle Bridgers especially. This is all documented in my data base at the Anthropology Department at MSU. To allow unlimited motorcycle travel in these fragile areas can do nothing but have a detrimental effect on a pristine study area of prehistory in the Bridgers.	West Bridgers North	One of the significant cultural resource issues which was carried through the entire planning process was that we not pioneer new travel routes into areas rich with archeological sites where existing trails don't already exist. The trail, identified for motorcycle use in the basins in and around Corbly, would not cross any of the many archeological sites in this vicinity nor enter into new areas rich with site complexes. Under OHV rules, motorcycle traffic would be restricted to the trail prism and thus not "unlimited", and as long as motorized traffic stays on the trail, there would be no detrimental effect to these sites or site complexes.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	619a		Additional Option #2: Consider adding the following goals to the Shields and North Bridgers TPAs for wildlife corridors. Goal: Migration Corridors. Provide for wildlife and movement between the Crazy Mountain Range and the Castle and Little Belt Mountain Ranges. MWF strongly supports pursing option 2. There is a body of work to substantiate that a migration corridor exists along the crest of the Rocky Mountains called the Yukon to Yellowstone (Y2Y) migration corridor. Movement through the Crazies to the Little Belts and Castle Mountains and from the Big Belt to and from the Bridgers is highly rated in some migration pattern models.	Goals and Objectives	Option 2 (page 2-41 of the DEIS) addresses potential wildlife movement corridors and their possible inclusion into Alternative 7M. Chapter 3 considered habitat connectivity summarizing literature and addressing LCAS identified linkage areas. At this time, there is no specific direction of how to manage for these linkage areas relative to travel planning, habitat manipulation, or development. The programmatic language for Alternative 7M does include a goal identifying specific movement corridors, and provides an opportunity to include others in future. The intent of the goal is to provide habitat connectivity consistent with wildlife movement patterns between mountain ranges and includes the area suggested by the commenter (the North Bridgers (linking the Bridger Range to the Big Belt Mountains; and the Shields (Crazy Mountains to the Castle and Little Belt Mountains). This management direction extends to the pertinent individual TPAs as well with a goal to provide for wildlife migration and movement.
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	619a		Additional Option #5) Consider adding the following Forest-wide objective for management of sensitive habitat. Objective: Sensitive species Habitat. Use special closure orders as a tool to site specifically manage transportation routes including restriction of human activities for specific periods of use based on a specific species annual activity. Objective: Sensitive Species Habitat(s): Identify essential habitat sites for species and establish appropriate temporal and spatial buffers, restricting human disturbance during sensitive times. Buffer zones should exclude all predictable activities and be adjusted for specific species and site information. Approximate Bald eagle nest chronology extends from April 1 to August 15. MWF supports adaptive management techniques used to mitigate impacts to critical fish and wildlife habitat such as are contained in this additional option. This would provide a valuable tool and should be adopted into the final travel plan.	Goals and Objectives	Option 5 (page 2-42 of the DEIS) addresses management objectives for sensitive wildlife habitat and their possible inclusion into Alternative 7M. The option of using special closure orders to restrict human access during specific species annual activity is an administrative tool already available to line officers and was not brought forward into Alternative 7M. The proposed programmatic direction that has been incorporated into Alternative 7M relative to sensitive species habitat is not worded exactly as originally proposed but captures the intent of your comment. Specifically, GOAL G addresses 'species of special management designation' (definition in glossary), which includes sensitive species. Guideline G-2 provides management direction to consider various appropriate mitigation options when any proposed motorized routes was found to adversely affect known occupied habitat.
Randy Wold		1625		For Limestone Trail please get the public to park their vehicle. Now, a new road exists from the old parking area, high into the mountains, where no road	West Bridgers North	Originally Corbly Gulch was a county road into the forest. The County abandoned the road in the early 1990's and the route has been managed as a trail by the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				existed a few years ago. End in the parking area, at the FS boundary.		Forest Service. A trailhead was constructed at the Forest boundary at this time. Since then, the public has breached the parking area and driven around the earth barriers. In Alt 7M, Corbly Gulch trail would be restricted to motorcycle use only. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301		Serious damage on a user created motorized trail already exists, ascending a side ridge to the south of the part of Corbly Gulch Trail 544 that was originally a road, originating at a point where the road narrows to become a trail along the creek bottom. Because of the areas important wildlife habitat and trail damage, Corbly Gulch trail should be closed to all motorized use.	West Bridgers North	Originally Corbly Gulch was a county road into the forest. The County abandoned the road in the early 1990's and the route has been managed as a trail by the Forest Service. In Alt 7M, Corbly Gulch trail would be restricted to motorcycle use only. All motorized trails would be identified on the travel plan map. Motorized use would only be allowed on designated trails. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Judy A. Rue	Sweet Grass County Recreation Association	1123		Keep all of Placer Gulch open. It's a new trail and makes a nice loop when combined with #5, #146, and FR 482. Creating a buffer zone without congressional approval for this trail is against the law. The snowmobilers currently use the area as a play area. There is so much Wilderness in the area don't take any more away.		Placer Gulch Trail #256 is proposed to be open for ATV', from it's start to its' junction with Lower Deer Creek Trail #5. I'm assuming the commenter refers to the earlier proposed restriction to snowmobiles along the wilderness boundary on the East Boulder Plateau in the vicinity to Placer Basin trail#2. This snowmobile restriction was dropped and is not carried forward in Alternative 7-M.
Christl Gump		139	Big Sky	Porcupine is a favorite trail for Big Sky residents. It is easy to get to and people use it when they have limited time. Families walk there with their kids and dogs. It should not be open to motorbikes. We need a quiet places that are easy to get to for recreation.	Porcupine Buffalo-Horn	Porcupine Trail #34 is currently open to motorcycle use. It would remain open to motorcycle use in Alt 7M. The season of use would be more restrictive than it is now, with these trails proposed to be open to motorcycles only from July 15 - Sept. 5 in Alt 7M. The Elkhorn Trail, Beehive Basin, North Fork of Bear Creek, and Yellow Mule/Ouzel Falls trails would all provide non-motorized hiking and biking opportunities close to Big Sky in the preferred alternative.
Patti Steinmuller		1132		Considering the popularity and heavy use of the emerald Lake and Hyalite Lake Trails and the trail erosion that has occurred, especially from motorized vehicles shortcutting the trail, I support closure of these trails to motorized use. Also, an alternative to the congestion that is currently experienced by hikers and mtn. bikers on the Emerald Lake and Hyalite Lake trails would be to establish rules that govern the use of these trails by hikers and mtn.	Hyalite	Problems with trails themselves is a facilities issue being dealt with separate from the Travel Plan. To begin to deal with user conflicts on this trail, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				bikers on an alternating basis, such as alternate day use.		
Rick Reed	Sweet Grass County Recreation Association	1496	Big Timber	East Boulder Road, namely Dry Fork needs a new bridge to access Dry Fork and Blacktail Trail.		Proposals for bridge replacement, as well as construction or repair of roads and trails, are outside the scope of the travel plan decision. In order to meet requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), such proposals must be analyzed at the site-specific level before a decision is made.
Wayne Moore		1443		Concerning the bridge problem off the East Boulder road, I-We would work with you on the bridge improvements to allow the use of motorized vehicles.		Proposals for bridge replacement, as well as construction or repair of roads and trails, are outside the scope of the travel plan decision. In order to meet requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), such proposals must be analyzed at the site-specific level before a decision is made.
Nellie Isreal	Beartooth Alliance	669		With regard to Lake Abundance Road #3219 Seg 3, we oppose closure of this segment and strongly urge the FS to keep this road open during the same season as Segs 1 and 2. This road is used by fishermen almost daily during the summer and by hunters in the fall. Thus, we recommend, following the general objective of Goal 3, that a bridge be built across the Stillwater River on the Lake Abundance Road to greatly reduce erosion in the Stillwater River.	Cooke City	Public input has been very much opposed to providing a loop opportunity in the Huckleberry-Tradenic areas if the Lake Abundance Road is shortened as mitigation for constructing the loops. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service proposes to eliminate the loop opportunities in favor of status quo on the Abundance Road. We will look at alternatives to reduce sedimentation in the Stillwater during the summer of 2006.
John and Carole Oldemeyer		839		Lake Abundance Road 3219, Seg. 3, we oppose closure of this segment and strongly urge the FS to keep this road open during the same season as Segs 1 and 2. This road is used by fishermen, almost daily during the summer and by hunters in the fall. We recommend, following the general objective of Goal 3, that a bridge be built across the Stillwater River on the Lake Abundance Road to greatly reduce erosion in the Stillwater River.	Cooke City	Public input has been very much opposed to providing a loop opportunity in the Huckleberry-Tradenic areas if the Lake Abundance Road is shortened as mitigation for constructing the loops. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service proposes to eliminate the loop opportunities in favor of status quo on the Abundance Road. We will look at alternatives to reduce sedimentation in the Stillwater during the summer of 2006.
Dean and Madelein Bladow		1191	Cooke City	With regards to Lake Abundance Road #3219 seg 3, we oppose closure of this segment and strongly urge the Forest Service to keep this road open during the same season as Segs 1 & 2. This road is used by fisherman almost daily during in the summer and by hunter in the fall. Thus we recommend, following the general objective of goal 3, that a bridge be built across Stillwater river on the Lake Abundance Road to greatly reduce erosion in the Stillwater River.	Cooke City	Public input has been very much opposed to providing a loop opportunity in the Huckleberry-Tradenic areas if the Lake Abundance Road is shortened as mitigation for constructing the loops. Alternative 7M proposes to eliminate the loop opportunities in favor of status quo on the Abundance Road. We will look at alternatives to reduce sedimentation in the Stillwater during the summer of 2006.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Robert Smith		166	Cooke City	The pulling back of the roads to Lake Abundance and Goose are a crucial item to the town of Cooke City and its economic viability, and we need to look into ways to responsibly manage the use of the land.	Cooke City	Pulling back the termini of the Abundance and Goose Lake roads was evaluated in this EIS, as mitigation for creating loop ATV opportunities. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service does not propose adding loop ATV opportunities in the Tradenic Pass area and as a result no changes to the Lake Abundance or Goose Lake roads are proposed.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Keep Ramshorn Peak trail open. The peak provides a nice 360 degree view.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Ramshorn Peak Trail is currently open to foot and stock (non-motorized) travel only. It remains open to these uses in all alternatives.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Keep Ramshorn Peak trail open. The peak provides a nice 360 degree view.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Ramshorn Peak Trail is currently open to foot and stock (non-motorized) travel. It remains open to these uses in the preferred alternative.
Judy A. Rue	Sweet Grass County Recreation Association	1123		Keep all of trail #2 open. This trail is the most relished trail in the area as it provides for excellent scenery and challenges. When combined with Cherry Creek #206 and Tomato Can #156 it is a premier motorcycle loop.		Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles.
Judy A. Rue	Sweet Grass County Recreation Association	1123		Keep all of the Tomato Can #156 open. It's fun and allows connections to three loop systems.		Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles.
Jerry Iverson		176	Big Timber	Please close Tomato Can Trail(#156) to motorized traffic for these reasons: 1. The existing trail is too steep and rocky in parts and to improve will require public funds that can be better used elsewhere. 2. Improvements will have negative impacts on natural values (i.e. ;peace and quite, sense of solitude_ leading to user conflict. In particular, please close #156 from the intersection of Ivory Mt. Road (482) to West Fork of Upper Deer Cr. West Fork does not have public road access and the suggested improvements to #156 will put unreasonable pressure on natural values.		Red Mountain Trail #156 is proposed to be open to motorcycles in Alternative 7-M. The trail is already to motorcycle standards (which are essentially the same standards as stock and foot trails). The trail has been open to motorcycles historically and no adverse resource impacts have due to this use have been observed.
Jim Barrett		881		Cottonwood Lake and Trespass Creek trails should be reserved for non-motorized users. These trails traverse wolverine habitat which would be harmed by motorized travel.	East Crazies	Relative to wolverine, the Chapter 3 effects analysis recognized both motorized and non-motorized use had disturbance effects on wolverine. In the summer, motorized use would not occur in the type of habitat the wolverine prefer, namely the subalpine and alpine cirque habitat at high elevations. The facility already exists and with the implementation of Alternative 7M (and all other alternatives except Alternative 1) motorized use would be restricted to the trail resulting in no additional impact

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						to wolverine habitat. Winter motorized (and non-motorized) use of this area may cause more severe disturbance impacts. Both Cottonwood and Trespass Creeks would be open during the winter but snowmobile closure areas would be implemented over a large proportion of the East Crazies TPA where dispersed snowmobile use currently takes place. Alternative 7M, through snowmobile area closures, would protect more winter wolverine habitat than under existing conditions.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The RNAs the Gallatin designated in 1977: These special areas were not included in the DEIS and we encourage the FS to review their proposal to determine what impacts might occur on the resources of these special places and make whatever changes are appropriate to preserve and protect those resources.	Issues	Research Natural Areas (RNAs) was added as an issue eliminated from detailed analysis in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. RNAs are a part of a national network of ecological areas designated in perpetuity for research and education and/or to maintain biological diversity on National Forest System lands (FSM 4063). Seven RNAs were established on the Gallatin Forest through an Environmental Assessment and Decision Notice in 1997. There would be no effect on RNAs from any of the travel plan alternatives.
Nellie Isreal	Beartooth Alliance	669		We oppose new ATV trails connecting Henderson Mountain Road #3223 with Daisy Pass. We do not encourage or support creating any loops which may serve "4-wheeling" as a sport rather than serving as transportation to trail heads, vistas, or lakes for the enjoyment of natural features.	Cooke City	Safety and concerns about amounts of maintenance needed are rationale for not extending the Henderson Mountain Road through to Fisher Mountain (past the Homestake Mine).
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Starting from the south end we discussed the possibility of time restriction the M access to trail #534 - Motorcycle access from dawn until 7 AM would be very acceptable. This would allow motorcycle access to trail #534 prior to the arrival of daily non-motorized users thereby preventing any potential use conflicts.	West Bridgers South	Alternative 7M would manage the Bridger Foothills Trail from the "M" Trailhead from the trailhead to it's junction with the Middle Cottonwood trail as closed to motorized uses, to provide dedicated trails for non-motorized uses. No alternative considers your exact suggestion. However, the "time share" concept is being considered on several trails proposed to be open for motorized uses close to Bozeman. Please see the ROD for the final decision on "time shared trails".
Loren Blanksma		1194		The Storm Castle trail (88) is a very popular hiking trail. After several years of driving by the trailhead, I took advantage of an empty parking lot one morning to ride that trail (88). The Storm Castle trail contains extremely tight switchbacks that were hard to negotiate on a motorcycle. I have no objections to closing this trail to motorcycles if the Wilson Creek Divide road (3138) remains open to motorized to the very end of the road. That would result in the Storm	Gallatin Roaded	Storm Castle Trail #92 is not currently managed for motorized use and in Alt 7M would remain non motorized. The Wilson Creek Divide Road #3138 would remain open to atv and motorcycle use.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Castle being accessible to motorized by means of a very short hike from the end of Wilson Creek Divide road (3138). The view from the top of the Storm Castle is breathtaking and it would be well worth the resulting short hike.		
Chris Alkeny		203	Bozeman	It looks as though the most southern access onto the crest trail will be Buffalo Horn (320 ranch). As you know the 320 ranch has horse trail rides coming out of this trailhead all summer. I think if more motorcycle traffic is directed towards that trailhead we will encounter more conflict between horse users and dirt bikes. I think that in keeping the Teepee access open to dirt bikes you will reduce conflict and give motorcycles a better access with less horse traffic	Porcupine Buffalo-Horn	Teepee Ck Trail #39 would be closed to motorcycle use in Alt 7M to remain in compliance with the Montana Wilderness Study Act and to provide for grizzly bear and other wildlife security. Refer to the ROD for the final decision and the rationale for it.
Loren Blanksma		36		#296 from Buffalo Horn Pass to Ramshorn Peak Trail #39 (Teepee Creek) is a good motorized access instead of Buffalo Horn in order to avoid 320 Ranch Dudes.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Teepee Ck Trail #39 would be closed to motorcycle use in Alt 7M to remain in compliance with the Montana Wilderness Study Act and to provide for grizzly bear and other wildlife security. Refer to the ROD for the final decision and the rationale for it.
Paul D. Herbel		1330		Teepee Creek Trail needs to stay open. I often opt to start my ride from here to Ramshorn Lake to avoid other groups from Big Sky. It is the furthest access point from Bozeman. I rarely see people there on Sundays. It keeps me from having to drive through the 320 Ranch.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Teepee Ck Trail #39 would be closed to motorcycle use in Alt 7M to remain in compliance with the Montana Wilderness Study Act and to provide for grizzly bear and other wildlife security. Refer to the ROD for the final decision and the rationale for it. Future plans would relocate the road and trailhead north out of the 320 Ranch guest ranch area.
Linda Ellison		1070		Given the access situation at the 320 ranch, many trail motorcyclists have gravitated to Teepee Creek to access the Porcupine/Buffalo Horn trail system. Trails 52, the Park boundary line trail to Dailey Pass between 52 and 57, and Trail 57 (Buffalo Horn Lakes) have historically been open to OHV use and should remain open to trail motorcycles. These routes "free up" the main buffalo Horn trail for other users and comply with grizzly bear guidelines with respect to not increasing motorized routes within the recovery area. Access to FS cabins is important for all visitors. They should be shared resources since everyone's tax dollars support them.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Teepee Ck Trail #39 would be closed to motorcycle use in Alt 7M to remain in compliance with the Montana Wilderness Study Act and to provide for grizzly bear and other wildlife security. Refer to the ROD for the final decision and the rationale for it. The rental cabin program provides a variety of access opportunities, both motorized and non motorized. The majority of the program is funded through user fees not tax payer dollars.
Charles Sumner		611	Cooke City	The proposed "loop road" that connects the Goose Lake road to the area north of Lulu Pass is a flawed proposal.	Cooke City	Thank you for your comment but it would be more useful if you elaborated as to why the proposal is flawed.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Will Robertson		304	Bozeman	I like that ATV use is emphasized in the Gallatin Roaded area. This area has many abandoned logging roads perfect for ATVs and few trails which hikers, mountain bikers, and equestrians have an interest in using. It makes sense.	Gallatin Roaded	Thank you for your comment. The Gallatin Roaded Travel Planning Area is a roaded area that seemed conducive to managing for motorized use.
Noreen Breeding		1823	Bozeman	These comments concern trails #120, 296, and 291 leaving from the Tom Miner Basin trailhead. In July 2005, I hiked to Ramshorn Peak from this trailhead, ascending via the petrified tree interpretive trail, then bushwhacking to the peak, and deciding on trails #296 and #120. The interpretive trail needs better signs to indicate where it goes and where it ends. Otherwise, it is much appreciated.	Tom Miner Rock	Thank you for your comment. The Interpretive Trail sign has disappeared on several occasions. We will continue to replace it as needed to provide better directions for users.
John and Carole Oldemeyer		839		We oppose new ATV trails connecting Henderson Mountain Road 3223 with Daisy Pass. We do not encourage or support creating any loops which may serve "4-wheeling" as a sport rather than serving as transportation to trailheads, vistas, or lakes for the enjoyment of natural features.	Cooke City	Thank you for your comment. We respect your opinion.
Emily Sandall	Outward Bound	1522		Area frequented by the Outward Bound program - the Huckleberry area is used several times a summer for solo experience, rock climbing, camping, environmental lessons, leave no trace lessons, and peak ascents. It also provides a way to get a resupply on Lolo pass. A motorized road would hinder the students experience greatly.	Cooke City	Thank you for your comment. We will consider it along with all other comments in making a final decision.
Bud Bolton		1197	Cooke City	I am against closing all areas south of Hwy 212 to snowmobiling. This area is little used by visitors other than snowmobilers and the negative economic impact to Cooke City, myself and my business would definitely be dramatic.	Cooke City	Thank you for your comment. We will consider it along with all other comments in making a final decision.
Fritz Schilling		1721	Silver Gate	It is very important to me that the selected option keep, as a minimum, access to Lake Abundance, Goose Lake, Sheep Mountain, which has the absolute greatest view of this area, and which I love to show family and visitors and I hope you have also experienced, Bull-of-the-Woods Pass, and the Reeb cabin overlooking Goose Creek. I really don't want to see any more of the frequently used roads closed.	Cooke City	Thank you for your comments.
Dean and Madelein Bladow		1191	Cooke City	We support the closure and signage of all unauthorized user-created ATV/motorized vehicle trails in the Cooke City Planning Area. Pertinent examples are the trails to Orvis and Corner Lakes	Cooke City	Thank you for your support. We will continue to sign, patrol and enforce violations within areas or on trails closed to motorized vehicles.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				and the trail up Woody Creek (trail 107).		
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 185 - Hyalite - Motorized - This makes a loop which is good for all, hiking, riding, viewing, etc.	Gallatin Crest	The 185 trail would remain open to motorcycle, stock, mountain biking, and hiking use in Alt 7M..
Rick D Sommers		596	Bozeman	In earlier times the land between Independence Peak and Lake Abundance was surveyed and there was even a road there. I propose we reopen that corridor.	Cooke City	The area between Independence and Lake Abundance was Congressionally designated as the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness. No motorized vehicles are allowed in congressionally designated wilderness. Opening the corridor to motorized vehicles would take an act of congress and is beyond the scope of this analysis.
John Criger		107	Lakewood, CO	Lynx: The DEIS and information form the Montana State Parks say the biggest detriment to their habitat is Interstate Highways and poorly supervised logging events where large clear cuts are allowed. It is not people use and trails that are the chief concerns. Recent documentation released by the Colorado Department of Wildlife that was obtained by radio tracking of the Lynx confirms the Lynx is not totally adverse to human activity.	Issues	The commenter is correct in pointing out that other factors may pose a risk to lynx habitat. The Gallatin travel plan alternatives do not analyze Federal Interstate or State Highways or logging. The analysis of direct and indirect effects of the travel plan alternatives focuses on the identified parameters as described in the Analysis Methodology section of Issue #13 Lynx in Chapter 3, based on the Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy (LCAS) standards and guidelines.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Preliminary information suggests that lynx may not avoid roads, except at high traffic volumes. Therefore, at this time, there is no compelling evidence to recommend management of road density to conserve lynx. However, new road construction continues to occur in many watersheds within lynx habitat, many of which are already highly road, and the effects on lynx are largely unknown. Further research directed at elucidating the effects of road density on lynx is needed.	Issues	The commenter is correct in suggesting that further research on the effects of road density is needed. The FEIS discloses various perspectives from literature and concluded that roads may pose a risk to the reproduction and/or survival of lynx. However, the recently published Federal Register (USDI 2003) addressed potential threats to lynx and concluded that the threat to lynx populations from high traffic volume on roads that bisect suitable lynx habitat is low. The LCAS provides a programmatic guideline for Forest backcountry roads and trails relative to road density at 2 mi/sq mi. The effects parameters for summer open road density (ORD) was met for all alternatives. Any new road construction would require additional NEPA.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		The DEIS refers to the Appendix for suggested additional mitigation for protection of riparian areas. The only Appendices we saw in the Travel Plan and DEIS are the Appendix A, Purpose and Need for Amending the Plan, Appendix B, Monitoring, and Appendix C, Glossary. It is not clear what Appendix is being referred to on page 3-373 of the DEIS for additional mitigation for protection of riparian areas.	Document	The commenter is correct to point this out. The Appendix referred to on page 3-373 of the DEIS was in the original specialist report which identified mitigation stated as programmatic direction language. This proposed language in the specialist report did not appear in the DEIS. However, the proposed language was considered for inclusion in the FEIS and ROD. It has been condensed and re-worded into the final programmatic direction found in the FEIS under

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Alternative 7M. Specifically, GOAL E and H address riparian habitats and direction is provided to fully support the protection of riparian habitats.
Joe Polus		1487		South Fork American Creek Trail 125 - Please make multiple use. It is highly offensive to motorized users to construct new trails using motorized equipment (trail making machines, ATVs, etc) and then close these trails to motorized use.		The commenter is expressing an opinion.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		SF American Cr Trail #125 - This is proposed new non-motorized route - please make multiple use. It is highly offensive to motorized users to construct new trails using motorized equipment (trail making machines, ATVs etc) & then close these trails to motorized use.		The commenter is expressing an opinion.
Jerome Onsager		955	Bozeman	Alternative 7 proposes a 5-fold increase in acreage of secured denning habitat for lynx, which is over-zealous and not justifiable.	Issues	The commenter may be equating secured denning habitat with the snowmobile closure areas, which were proposed in each alternative to address various resource issues, but not to create lynx 'secured denning habitat'. The analysis for lynx did not evaluate denning habitat but analyzed effects to lynx of each alternative based on the identified parameters as described in the Analysis Methodology section of Issue #13 Lynx in Chapter 3. The parameter for measuring the effect of winter motorized use is the net change in miles of marked or groomed (i.e., designated) over-the-snow (snowmobile and ski) routes and acres of closed snowmobile area. The LCAS directs no net increase in groomed or marked (and therefore “designated”) over-the-snow routes unless it is accompanied by a consolidation of use resulting in a net reduction of compacted snow areas within the same LAU. The effect of Alternative 7M indicated that there would be a net increase of 75 miles and an increase in snowmobile closure area of 318,427 acres from Alternative 1. Alternative 7M met the LCAS due to the snowmobile closure area acres coupled with the increase in over-the-snow routes and other qualitative factors that were considered.
Brad Grein	Citizens For Balanced Use	1302	Bozeman	John Squires: he has discovered that there is no risk to the Lynx by the compacted snow theory and that snowmobiles have not affected populations in his study area.	Issues	The commenter notes one aspect of the DEIS discussion of the indirect effects of winter routes. Information on current research was presented in Chapter 3 including that to which the commenter refers. In addition to the qualitative discussion, the analysis for lynx focused on effects to lynx of each alternative based

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						on the identified parameters as described in the Analysis Methodology section of Issue #13 Lynx in Chapter 3. The parameter for measuring the effect of winter motorized use is miles of marked or groomed (i.e., designated) over-the-snow (snowmobile and ski) routes and acres of closed snowmobile area. The LCAS directs no net increase in groomed or marked (and therefore "designated") over-the-snow routes unless it is accompanied by a consolidation of use resulting in a net reduction of compacted snow areas within the same LAU. The effect of Alternative 7M indicated that there would be a net increase of 75 miles and an increase in snowmobile closure area of 318,427 acres from Alternative 1. As proposed, Alternative 7M met the LCAS due to the increase in over-the-snow routes coupled with the snowmobile closure area acres and other qualitative factors that were considered.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	The DEIS on pg 3-272 states, "There continues to be no solid data on the role of competition between the lynx and other species. In the recently published Federal Register (USDI 2003) that addressed potential threats to the lynx, the Fish and Wildlife Service concluded: No evidence has been provided that packed snow trails facilitate competition to a level that negatively affect to lynx populations, but possibly to individuals. Neither factors are considered threats to lynx populations, but possibly to individuals." To limit motorized use based on negative lynx impact is discriminatory.	Issues	The commenter refers to one aspect of the DEIS discussion of the indirect effects of winter routes related to potential competition for prey with other predators. However, the commenter incorrectly assumed that lynx provided the rationale for limits in motorized uses. There were no motorized use restrictions based on lynx. Winter and summer route configurations, and snowmobile closure areas were proposed in each alternative to address various resource issues, not due to lynx. In addition to the qualitative discussion, the analysis for lynx focused on effects to lynx of each alternative based on the identified parameters as described in the Analysis Methodology section of Issue #13 Lynx in Chapter 3. The parameter for measuring the effect of winter motorized use is miles of marked or groomed (i.e., designated) over-the-snow (snowmobile and ski) routes and acres of closed snowmobile area. The LCAS directs no net increase in groomed or marked (and therefore "designated") over-the-snow routes unless it is accompanied by a consolidation of use resulting in a net reduction of compacted snow areas within the same LAU. The effect of Alternative 7M indicated that there would be a net increase of 75 miles and an increase in snowmobile closure area of 318,427 acres from Alternative 1. As proposed, Alternative 7M met the LCAS due to the increase in over-the-snow

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						routes coupled with the snowmobile closure area acres and other qualitative factors that were considered.
				Having done some research regarding the Crow Indian Tribe I find there appears to be no valid reason they should have any say in the closure of the crazy mountain trails and roads. As they proclaim most of Montana, northern Wyoming and parts of North and South Dakota as part of their historic lands and had the vision quests in many of these mountain areas how can they focus on just the Crazies?	Shields	The Crazies have particular importance to some Crow as other places have similar historical and traditional importance to others. However, four important Crow Chiefs had a specific historical association with the Crazies and are broadly accepted as quite important individuals in Crow history. All received important dreams from fasting in the Crazy Mountains and many Crow still hold that the Crazies still have a particularly prestigious association with Crow history and tradition. Additionally, while the Crow do proclaim interest in the broad territory identified in this comment, the Crazies are specifically within Fort Laramie Crow Treaty Lands of 1851 and 1868, finally being ceded in 1882. As such, the Crazies remain as a territory with a special relationship between the sovereign Crow Nation and the US Federal Government.
Wayne Moore		1443	Big Timber	Placer Basin Trail #2, I'd like to see the wilderness boundary left where it is. Closure to motorized vehicles will create more problems.		The earlier proposed closure was not carried forward in Alternative 7-M.
Phyllis Spencer		1560	Big Timber	Placer Basin Trail #2 - don't need a buffer zone. Leave Wilderness boundary alone, closure to motorized vehicles will create more problems.		The earlier proposed restriction to snowmobiles along the wilderness boundary on the East Boulder Plateau in the vicinity to Placer Basin trail#2. This snowmobile restriction was dropped and is not carried forward in Alternative 7-M.
Rocky Heineman		1327	Grey Cliff	Iron Mountain Road up by Picket Pin Mountain. To have a buffer zone up against the main road would create many infractions because of the closeness of the main road.		The earlier proposed restriction to snowmobiles along the wilderness boundary on the East Boulder Plateau in the vicinity to Placer Basin trail#2. This snowmobile restriction was dropped and is not carried forward in Alternative 7-M.
Roger Raw		963	Big Timber	The East Boulder should be left as is. Extending the area for ease of patrolling only ruins some prime areas for snowmobilers - some prime play areas.		The earlier proposed restriction to snowmobiles along the wilderness boundary on the East Boulder Plateau in the vicinity to Placer Basin trail#2. This snowmobile restriction was dropped and is not carried forward in Alternative 7-M.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Much of the lynx habitat on the Gallatin occurs in mid to low elevation areas that have been roaded and logged in the past. To mitigate the impacts of motorized access on lynx habitat in the Gallatin the final travel plan should contain the following prescriptions: no increasing groomed over the snow routes and lynx habitat; restrict all motorized use to	Issues	The effects of motorized access was described in Chapter 3 along with how those effects were analyzed based on the Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy (LCAS) standards and guidelines. Roads may pose a risk to the reproduction and/or survival of lynx within a particular home range. However, the recently published Federal Register (USDI 2003) addressed

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				designated routes including designated play areas for snowmobiles; locate designated routes and play areas to ensure sufficiently large blocks of secure habitat with sufficient connectivity between core habitat; and enact a forest wide TMRD of 1 mile per square mile.		potential threats to lynx and concluded that the threat to lynx populations from high traffic volume on roads that bisect suitable lynx habitat is low. The LCAS provides a programmatic guideline for Forest backcountry roads and trails relative to road density at 2 mi/sq mi. The effects parameters for summer open road density (ORD) was met for all alternatives. The parameter for measuring the effect of winter motorized use is miles of marked or groomed (i.e., designated) over-the-snow (snowmobile and ski) routes and acres of closed snowmobile area. The LCAS directs no net increase in groomed or marked (and therefore "designated") over-the-snow routes unless it is accompanied by a consolidation of use resulting in a net reduction of compacted snow areas within the same LAU. The effect of Alternative 7M indicated that there would be a net increase of 75 miles and an increase in snowmobile closure area of 318,427 acres from Alternative 1. As proposed, Alternative 7M met the LCAS due to the increase in over-the-snow routes coupled with the snowmobile closure area acres and other qualitative factors that were considered.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		No increase in groomed over the snow lynx habitat. Lynx are dependent on their specialized ability to pursue snowshoe hare in deep soft snow, which makes them susceptible to competition from other more generalized predators when these predators access lynx habitat by groomed over the snow.	Issues	The effects of motorized trails was qualitatively described in Chapter 3 including recent research regarding competition from predators on packed snow. The parameter to measure effects quantitatively were based on the Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy (LCAS) standards and guidelines. The parameter for measuring the effect of winter motorized use is miles of marked or groomed (i.e., designated) over-the-snow (snowmobile and ski) routes and acres of closed snowmobile area. The LCAS directs no net increase in groomed or marked (and therefore "designated") over-the-snow routes unless it is accompanied by a consolidation of use resulting in a net reduction of compacted snow areas within the same LAU. The effect of Alternative 7M indicated that there would be a net increase of 75 miles and an increase in snowmobile closure area of 318,427 acres from Alternative 1. Alternative 7M met the LCAS due to the increase in over-the-snow routes coupled with the snowmobile closure area acres and other qualitative factors that were considered.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Kathleen A. Gordon	The Summit Lighthouse and Church Universal and Triumphant	1236		The Yankee Jim maps in the Plan do not include the depiction of FS roads and trails that could be used for non-motorized access. This effectively deprives the public of information about existing public routes and opportunities and erroneously directs the public to and across private property.	Yankee Jim Canyon	The existing Gallatin Forest Travel Plan Map depicts the locations of all Forest Service system roads and trails.
Kathleen A. Gordon	The summit Lighthouse and Church Universal and Triumphant	1236		The Yankee Jim maps in the Plan do not include the depiction of FS roads and trails that could be used for non-motorized access. This effectively deprives the public of information about existing public routes and opportunities and erroneously directs the public to and across private property.	Yankee Jim Canyon	The existing Gallatin Forest Travel Plan Map depicts the locations of all Forest Service system roads and trails.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The travel map indicated that spur road 6644 stemming from the East Boulder was to be closed to motorized. I have not ridden this road, but I do wonder why it would need to be closed. The other roads (East Boulder, Picket Pin) should remain open to motorized use.		The existing open Lewis Gulch Road will remain open with the proposed Alternative 7-M. The closed road the commenter mentions as shown on the travel plan map is a historical route and currently closed spur road. The other roads mentioned will also remain open.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		The lynx research has not yet to find a specific "threshold" road density for lynx habitat, it is clear that the fewer roads into lynx habitat the better. Where lynx habitat overlaps with grizzly bear habitat or important habitat for elk, USFWS should urge hasty progress toward ensuring that road density standards to protect those species is made.	Issues	The FEIS discloses various perspectives from literature and concluded that roads may pose a risk to the reproduction and/or survival of lynx. The LCAS provides a programmatic guideline for Forest backcountry roads and trails relative to road density at 2 mi/sq mi. The effects parameters for summer open road density (ORD) was met for all alternatives. Any new road construction would require additional NEPA.
Todd Hoitsma		1340		Foothills Trail between Corbly and Bridger Bowl: due to steep slope of this, the dirt bikes have caused considerable gullying and a erosion.	West Bridgers North	The Foothills Trail #534 is open to multiple uses including running and dirt bikes. The District plans to reconstruct portions of this trail through capital investment funding. Resource damage would be reconstructed and steep slopes would be reconstructed. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Bruce Granger		917	Bozeman	It makes no sense to allow motorized vehicle travel in the Bridgers or Gallatin's, which invariably results in degradation of the land, spread of noxious weeds and disruption of wildlife.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that motorized travel is an appropriate use of National Forest System lands where it can be managed for in a way that does not result in unacceptable resource damage.
Barbara and Jack Klingerman		510	Bozeman	I would like to urge the adoption of the most restrictive plan for motorized vehicles in the GNF. There are four reasons for this request: Enclosed is a photo of trash collected in one hike last year by a group of men from Bozeman. We were in the Moose Creek/Swan Creek area on forest roads currently	Non-motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that motorized travel is an appropriate use of National Forest System lands where it can be managed for in a way that does not result in unacceptable resource damage.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				accessible to motorized vehicles. At one site, where we collected most of the beer cans, there were shotgun shells scattered all around. To be sure, not everyone who uses a motorized vehicle abuses the land as did these unknown people, but the disrespect for the land is not something hikers engage in. ….Another reason comes from simply looking at the shape of a trail in the GNF which takes off from the road up to Hyalite Reservoir. The first part of the trail followed a forest road that was accessible to motorized vehicles. It was wide, eroded, and washed out in a number of areas. Then we reached the watershed divide between the Sourdough Creek and Hyalite drainages, the trail became a narrow hiking trail with little or no erosion. It was heavily used but not abused.		
Becky Johnson		1353		What is the current and future status of Sin Nombre Road? And a follow up to that question-what is the current and future status of access into the Crevice area?	Questions	The Forest Service continues to work with the Park County Commission and private landowners in the Crevice area to resolve the access issue. The Crevice access decision will likely occur outside the Travel Plan process.
Andy Copeland		1245		Add a trailhead at Bostwick Canyon and maintain it for hiking and mountain biking.	West Bridgers South	The Forest Service has no access through the mouth of Bostwick Canyon. This is all private land.
Heidi Barrett		617		Another important area for cross-country skiing would be the Woody Creek trail loop. This area should also be maintained for non-motorized users year round. The Woody Creek Trail can be accessed easily right from Cooke City and no additional travel is required.	Cooke City	The Forest Service proposes closing the Woody Creek area to snowmobiles in some travel plan alternatives. It is also desirable to local snowmobilers as a "retreat" from the popular places that most visitors snowmobile. In all alternatives, it remains as an opportunity for cross country skiers. In Alternative 7M, the Forest Service proposes to leave the Woody Creek area open to snowmobiles.
Catherine R. Brandon		584		Tom Miner to Ramshorn Lake #120 area, motorcyclist should use the Buffalo Horn Pass/Ramshorn Lake trail. The livestock should go up the Sunlight Trail #291 - 160 to Ramshorn Lake, this way you would not have livestock and motorcycles passing each other.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The grazing of livestock discussion is outside the scope of the Travel Plan decision. Livestock are not restricted to the use of a trail. The Trail and Sunlight Creek areas are both within the Ramshorn unit of the Tom Miner/Ramshorn cattle allotment. Depending on the annual management plan, cattle may or may not be present in these areas between July 1 and October 15.
Charles M. Paden and Janis R. Bullock		1474a	Bozeman	We strongly support the continued closure of Big Timber and Sweetgrass Creeks to all motorized travel as indicated in the Preferred Alternative. We have backpacked from these trailheads and know they are heavily used by both backpackers and stock		The legal easement across private property in these areas are for foot and horse use only.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				parties, and this level of usage is incompatible with motorized.		
Jenny McCune	Gallatin Valley Bicycle Club	762	Bozeman	To protect trails, wildlife and a pristine wilderness experience - I would urge the Forest Service to keep the closure of Big Timber and Sweetgrass Creek (east side of the Crazies) closed to all motorized traffic.		The legal easement across private property in these areas are for foot and horse use only.
Joe Gutkoski		120	Bozeman	Please continue to protect Big Timber Creek and Sweetgrass Creek from both summer and winter use to retain its roadless value for future generations. Please make trespass Creek and Cottonwood trails motorfree because these trails are too narrow for motorized.		The legal easement across private property in these areas are for foot and horse use only.
Shana Wood		1715	Livingston	I support the proposal for the east side (Big Timber and Sweetgrass drainages). Maintaining the current access by foot and horse travel only is an appropriate use for this area.		The legal easement across private property in these areas are for foot and horse use only.
Todd Orr		840		115 - Big Timber Canyon - If Fs has legal access, then suggest gaining access and managing trail as open to motorcycle to provide at least this one opportunity on the east side of the Crazies.		The legal easement across private property in these areas are for foot and horse use only.
Pat Simmons	Sierra Club	1545		The FS recommendation to allow a snowmobile route to cross from the vicinity of Tom Miner Basin to Hwy 191 is incompatible with the tenets of a WSA and inconsistent with the provisions of the 1977 Montana Wilderness Study Act and does not comply with the 2001 Molloy ruling.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The Malloy ruling stated that motorized use could continue in areas where it occurred in 1977. The opportunity was available to snowmobilers in 1977. There are verbal accounts of snowmobilers occasionally using the area at that time. Alternative 7M closes the corridor to snowmobiles.
Todd Orr		840		545 North Cottonwood - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use and long loop out Corbly or access to BFT. Conflicts minimal due to minimal use by most users. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	West Bridgers North	The North Cottonwood trail (545) is accessed from the west through a lease from the landowner to FWP. It only allows non motorized access. This trail eventually intersects with Limestone trail #544 to the south which would remain open to motorcycle use . A motorized loop would remain open to the south . North Cottonwood is managed as non motorized. It would be closed to motorized in Alt 7M.
Mitch Billis		35	Bozeman	I can't understand why the Bridger trail north to Flathead pass on the west side would be closed. We redefined the trail with dirt bike and have maintained it for 8 years now. The only ones to use it seems is a few very qualified dirt bikers. Please reconsider.	West Bridgers North	The North Cottonwood trail (545) is accessed from the west through a lease from the landowner to FWP. It only allows non motorized access. This trail eventually intersects with Limestone trail #544 to the south. North Cottonwood is managed as non motorized. It would be closed to motorized in Alt 7M. The trail to the north is a non system trail and not maintained. It is not planned for addition to the trail system in Alt 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Todd Orr		840		120 - Tom Miner Basin - Manage as is for motorcycle use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The opportunity to motorcycle from Tom Miner to Buffalo Horn was available in 1977. The opportunity remains in our preferred alternative
Todd Orr		840		120 - Tom Miner Basin - Manage as is for motorcycle use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The opportunity to motorcycle from Tom Miner to Buffalo Horn was available in 1977. The opportunity remains in several alternatives.
Pat Simmons	Sierra Club	1545		The FS recommendation to allow a snowmobile route to cross from the vicinity of Tom Miner Basin to Hwy 191 is incompatible with the tenets of a WSA and inconsistent with the provisions of the 1977 Montana Wilderness Study Act and does not comply with the 2001 Molloy ruling.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The opportunity was available to snowmobilers in 1977. There are only verbal accounts of snowmobilers using the area at that time.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The newly proposed snowmobile route between Fairy Lake and Flathead pass bisects one of the largest contiguous block of lynx habitat on the East side of the range. Combined with the dispersed use that will accompany this route, the remaining lynx habitat to the north and south is largely isolated. In comparison, the groomed loop route in the shields basin, while still in lynx habitat has much less impact. While it does create an island of habitat, there is a large connected block of habitat surrounding the loop. If combined with a reasonably designated play area based on local conditions, this loop could provide recreational opportunity without unnecessarily jeopardizing lynx.	Issues	The parameter for measuring the effect of winter motorized use is miles of marked or groomed (i.e., designated) over-the-snow (snowmobile and ski) routes and acres of closed snowmobile area. The LCAS directs no net increase in groomed or marked (and therefore “designated”) over-the-snow routes unless it is accompanied by a consolidation of use resulting in a net reduction of compacted snow areas within the same LAU. Both of these areas were analyzed as part of the Bridger/ Bangtails and the West Crazies LAU in the FEIS. The Bridger/ Bangtails LAU indicates a net increase of over-the-snow routes under all alternatives; the amount of area closed to snowmobiles varies by alternative. This alternative would allow snowmobile use in the Fairy Lake area which would still receive heavy use and compaction by backcountry skiers if it were closed to snowmobiles. It would further restrict snowmobile use on the northwest side of the Bridger ridge which is less accessible to backcountry skiers, considered rideable snowmobile terrain, and contains approximately the same amount of lynx habitat as the Fairy Lake area where snowmobiling would be allowed. While this may appear to break up the connectivity north to south, it would still serve to concentrate use on marked and groomed routes and reduce overall compaction across the landscape, thus meeting the intent of the LCAS. For the West Crazies LAU, Alternatives 7M had a net increase of 17 miles but with substantial amounts of snowmobile closure area acres, approximately ½ of which is quality lynx habitat. The routes proposed to be marked occur in areas currently

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						receiving some dispersed snowmobile and ski use. In both areas, the proposed snowmobile closure areas would preclude snowmobile use in some areas currently receiving use and would serve to consolidate use to marked, groomed, or areas otherwise open to snowmobiles. Alternatives 7M would meet the intent of the LCAS due to the favorable combination of net increases in route miles and snowmobile closure area acres. Chapter 3 also considered habitat connectivity summarizing literature and addressing LCAS identified linkage areas. At this time, there is no specific direction of how to manage for these linkage areas relative to travel planning, habitat manipulation, or development.
Bill Kaiser		20	Absarokee	As a handy capped person my only way of getting around is by motorized vehicle such as pickup or 4 wheeler. I have enjoyed riding my 4 wheeler in the picket pen and Benbo area, as well as Myers Creek.	Deer Creeks	The Picket Pin Road (FR#140) is proposed to be open to full-size vehicles; the existing mining roads on the East Boulder Plateau are proposed to be open to ATV's; and the Graham Creek Trail #117, and Blacktail Creek Trail #20 are proposed to be open to motorcycles. The Dry Fork Road is proposed to be open to full size vehicles to where the road becomes a trail on the east side of Section 7, then is open to ATV's to a point just west of Moccasin Lake where the trail becomes single track, and then open to motorcycles to its' junction with Trail #2. This provides the widest range of recreational opportunities given the capability of the resources.
John Criger		107	Lakewood, CO	Why would you want to develop a mountain bike trail near Cutler Lake when you could utilize an area like Aldridge that already has well established roads including numerous trails? The Aldridge area could easily be developed into a self guided interpreted area that would encompass the; town site, lake, cemetery, coke ovens, and other left over mining equipment to a broad based number of users including OHV users. Why you could probably make it a special fee use area.	Yankee Jim Canyon	The proposed mountain biking opportunity in the Cutler Lake area currently occurs totally on national forest system lands. There is an existing two-track road system that is closed to motorized travel. There is minimal need to develop additional improvements except for a few short connector trails. It is our intention to let people know the opportunity exists. Access to Aldridge Lake is across private land. Portions of the road up the Spring Gulch route are on the historic County road right-of-way, but some portions are not. Most of the townsite, coke ovens, and old mining equipment are on private land. We will continue to work with the adjacent private landowners to acquire better public access to Aldridge Lake and if the opportunity arises, the Forest Service would pursue trail access to the Lake. The concept of a self-guided trail opportunity is a good one.
Todd Orr		840		551 - Brackett to Ross Pass - manage as is for motorized use.	West Bridgers North	The relocated S Fork Road allows access to Ross Peak and Trail 534 will allow motorcycles to travel to the west

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						side of the Bridgers and onto the Foothills trail system north of Middle Cottonwood. There will be motorcycle access to Ross pass via a new connector trail. Trails #500 and 551 would remain open to motorcycles and the Fairy Lake trail (trail #500) would also be an ATV opportunity to Fairy Lake.
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	1441		Lynx: though road density and groomed snowmobile trails in Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 does not adequately protect core Canadian lynx habitat. Due to the threatened status of this animal, it would behoove the Forest to maximize lynx protections.	Issues	The response to this comment is similar to comment #1302. The effects of motorized access was described in Chapter 3 along with how those effects were analyzed based on the Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy (LCAS) standards and guidelines. The effects parameters for summer open road density (ORD) was met for all alternatives. In addition, Alternative 7M met the LCAS due to the increase in over-the-snow routes coupled with the snowmobile closure area acres and other qualitative factors that were considered.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Elevated levels of human access into forests are a significant threat to Canada lynx because they increase the likelihood of lynx encountering people, which may result in displacement of lynx from their habitats and/or possible injuries or deaths by intentional or unintentional shooting, trapping, and vehicle accidents.	Issues	The response to this comment is similar to comment #1302. The FEIS discloses various perspectives from literature and concluded that roads may pose a risk to the reproduction and/or survival of lynx. However, the recently published Federal Register (USDI 2003) addressed potential threats to lynx and concluded that the threat to lynx populations from high traffic volume on roads that bisect suitable lynx habitat is low.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Restrict all motorized use to designated routes including designated play areas for snowmobiles. Dispersed snowmobile use creates a network of pathways that generalized predators such as bobcat and coyotes can exploit to compete with lynx.	Issues	The response to this comment is similar to comment #1617. The effects of motorized trails was described in Chapter 3 along with how those effects were analyzed based on the Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy (LCAS) standards and guidelines. Alternative 7M met the LCAS due to the increase in over-the-snow routes coupled with the snowmobile closure area acres and other qualitative factors that were considered.
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	1441	Helena	Alternative 7 seems to fall short in fish and wildlife habitat protection. Does not address Canadian lynx needs for unbroken high country snows which facilitate capture of their preferred prey, the snowshoe hare. Persistent snowmobile trails open corridor worse for general predators by coyotes into otherwise inaccessible highlands to compete with the Lynx for prey; this impact is not discussed in Alternative 7 nor any mitigation measures offered.	Issues	The response to this comment is similar to comment #1617. The effects of motorized trails was described in Chapter 3 along with how those effects were analyzed based on the Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy (LCAS) standards and guidelines. Alternative 7M met the LCAS due to the increase in over-the-snow routes coupled with the snowmobile closure area acres and other qualitative factors that were considered. No mitigation for lynx was needed to ameliorate adverse effects.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	619a		Alternative 7 does not address Canadian lynx needs for unbroken high country snows which facilitate capture of their preferred prey, the snowshoe hare. Persistent snowmobile trails opens corridors for general predators like coyotes into otherwise inaccessible highlands to compete with the lynx for prey; this impact is not discussed in Alternative 7 nor mitigation measures offered.	Issues	The response to this comment is similar to comment #1617. The effects of motorized trails was described in Chapter 3 along with how those effects were analyzed based on the Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy (LCAS) standards and guidelines. Alternative 7M met the LCAS due to the increase in over-the-snow routes coupled with the snowmobile closure area acres and other qualitative factors that were considered. No mitigation for lynx was needed to ameliorate adverse effects.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Locate designated routes and play areas to ensure sufficiently large blocks of secure habitat with sufficient connectivity between core habitat. An examination of the proposed snowmobile routes for the Bridgers and the Crazies overlaid on lynx habitat illustrates the FS failure to adequately address these concerns.	Issues	The response to this comment is similar to comment #1617. The parameter for measuring the effect of winter motorized use is miles of marked or groomed (i.e., designated) over-the-snow (snowmobile and ski) routes and acres of closed snowmobile area. The LCAS directs no net increase in groomed or marked (and therefore "designated") over-the-snow routes unless it is accompanied by a consolidation of use resulting in a net reduction of compacted snow areas within the same LAU. Both of these areas were analyzed as part of the Bridger/ Bangtails and the West Crazies LAU in the FEIS. In both areas, the proposed snowmobile closure areas would preclude snowmobile use in some areas currently receiving use and would serve to consolidate use to marked, groomed, or areas otherwise open to snowmobiles. Alternatives 7M would meet the intent of the LCAS due to the favorable combination of net increases in route miles and snowmobile closure area acres. Chapter 3 also considered habitat connectivity summarizing literature and addressing LCAS identified linkage areas. At this time, there is no specific direction of how to manage for these linkage areas relative to travel planning, habitat manipulation, or development.
Bob Ebinger/ Robin Hoggan Ebinger		906	Livingston	Cottonwood Lake and Trespass Creek trails should be reserved for non-motorized users. These trails traverse wolverine and lynx habitat which would be harmed by motorized travel.	Ibex	The response to this comment is similar to comment #881. The West Crazies LAU covers the entire West side of the Crazy Mountains. Alternative 7M met the LCAS for the West Crazies LAU of which Ibex and East Crazies TPA are a part. The effects analysis for lynx and wolverine in Chapter 3 of the FEIS address potential impacts of summer and winter motorized and non-motorized uses in these areas.
Norbert Lehenbauer		398		Many short trails have been closed in recent years. I hope that many of these can be reopened with a little	Cooke City	The road from the Goose Lake Jeep Road to Corner Lake is not "open" to motorized travel in the current

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				work done to prevent damage that may have been done. The trail to Corner Lake is a good example. It's a short ride off the main trail and provides some fishing for those of us who can no longer hike.		Gallatin Forest Travel Plan. It is less than 1000 feet to the lake from the Goose Lake Jeep Road. In order to protect the fragile lakeshore around Corner Lake we recommend no change to the current travel plan designation.
Norbert Lehenbauer		398		Many short trails have been closed in recent years. I hope that many of these can be reopened with a little work done to prevent damage that may have been done. The trail to Corner Lake is a good example. It's a short ride off the main trail and provides some fishing for those of us who can no longer hike.	Cooke City	The road from the Goose Lake Jeep Road to Corner Lake is not "open" to motorized travel in the current Gallatin Forest Travel Plan. It is less than 1000 feet to the lake from the Goose Lake Jeep Road. In order to protect the fragile lakeshore around Corner Lake we recommend no change to the current travel plan designation.
Merv Olson		111	Gardiner	The road under the power lines from Raymond stemmata prop south of Little trail Creek to shooting range- parallel to highway would make a good access road for Handicap hunters during hunting season.	Gardiner Basin	The Trail Creek area is within the Hellroaring Grizzly Bear Management Sub-Unit. The power line road you describe is currently closed to all motorized vehicles. While this route may provide an opportunity for disabled hunters we cannot open additional road mileage without closing the same amount of mileage within the sub unit.
Catherine Weeden		1604		There is no record of snowmobiles in the Tom Miner Basin in 1977, and there should not be an across-the-ridge provision for these machines in the winter plan.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	There are only verbal accounts of snowmobilers using Tom Miner Basin in 1977.
Catherine Weeden		1604		There is no record of snowmobiles in the Tom Miner Basin in 1977, and there should not be an across-the-ridge provision for these machines in the winter plan.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	There are only verbal accounts of snowmobilers using Tom Miner Basin in 1977. Alternative 7M closes the corridor to snowmobiles.
Henry Rashjian		1708		As to the issue of closing these areas to motorized use because of Native American use, I am sure that old sacred areas are defiled by just the presence of outsiders, not just outsiders on motorized vehicles. So, I guess it should be all or none.	East Crazies	There are particular areas or settings that are sought for various individual and traditional reasons. The Crow Cultural Committee, a group of recognized elders and traditional leaders have made it known that there are many areas in the Crazies still quite suitable for the continuity of historical and traditional practices in the Crazies. They have identified these areas, and while they require that we do not release specific locations, they have worked with us to design a travel plan that provides protection of these areas.
Todd Orr		840		Mount Baldy Trail: Section 33 - Suggest leaving as is because of minimal use and no obvious erosion, damage or conflicts.	West Bridgers South	There would be no motorized use to Mount Baldy in Alt 7M
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-	1440		We support the proposal to manage the M Trails and Sypes Canyon #531 and the section of Foothills Trail #534 connecting them as motor free to prevent user conflicts and public safety concerns. We also	West Bridgers South	These opportunities would remain available in Alt 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Gallatin Chapter			support the proposal to allow foot travel only on the Bridger Ridge Trail to prevent user conflict, promote public safety, and lessen disturbance of wildlife and damage to sensitive soils.		
Noreen Breeding		454		More long trails with good views and connections to other hiking trails are needed on the east side of the valley. All opportunities in that location are monopolized by motorcycles and ATVs in all alternatives. Hood Creek (#436) would make a good hiking trail, particularly because it connects with non-motorized trail #462.	Hyalite	These trails are currently managed for motorized use. Alt 7M would continue motorized use. As noted in your comment, several trails in this area provide a non motorized experience. The public is likely to accept some motorized use in Hyalite due to the more urban setting and high public use.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		The Hood Creek Trail (#436) would make a good hiking trail, particularly because it connects with non-motorized trail #462. Also, there are many opportunities for hiking on abandoned roads in the Moser area, especially where they connect to trails from Bozeman Creek, Kirk Hill, and Leverich Canyon, but OHVs keep expanding the illegal network. Motorcycles and ATVs should be prohibited from the Moser area, and gates on secondary, branch roads should be closed to prevent 4x4 traffic.	Hyalite	These trails are currently managed for motorized use. Alt 7M would continue motorized use. Under Alternative 7-M several trails in this area provide a non motorized experience.
Nancy Loen		1024	Gardiner	N Cottonwood, Sypes, M trails: the growing older population of families and older people in Bozeman will need these areas to use the forest in a quiet way.	West Bridgers South	These trails, #545, #531, and the portion of the #534 trail south of Middle Cottonwood to the "M" parking lot would be closed to motorized use in Alt 7M. The "M" trail system including Trails #511, 512, 513 would also be closed to motorized use.
David A. and Carolyn L. Swingle		1136	Bozeman	The Hyalite Road should be paved to Chisholm campground due to the horrendous potholing from winter use that now occurs.	Hyalite	This is a facilities issue and outside the scope of travel planning. Contact the Bozeman District Ranger regarding this issue.
Connie Lien	Gallatin Saddle 7 Harness Club	206	Bozeman	Shooting in Hyalite Canyon is horrendous and unsafe. It is too often mixed with alcohol, evening and weekends.	Hyalite	This is an administrative issue and outside the scope of travel planning. Contact the Bozeman District Ranger regarding this issue.
Kathryn Hiestand and Neal Miller		337	Bozeman	We enjoy walking, skiing, snowshoeing up Bozeman Creek, Leverich and South Cottonwood Canyons. We are pleased that alternative seven does not allow motorized vehicles up any of these canyons.	Non-Motorized (General)	This management would continue in Alt 7M.
Linda Ellison		1070		There is also an old trail up Flanders Creek that could be re-established and added to the system to further disperse use in the Emerald-Heather area. It was abandoned with the logging on lower Flanders Creek in the late 60's and was never re-opened. I would rather see $$ spent on something like this for	Hyalite	The Heather/Emerald and Hyalite Trails would be managed as open for motorcycle travel in the preferred alternative. These routes are also being considered for "time shared" use where they would be open to motorized uses on certain days, and dedicated to non-motorized uses on other days. Please see the ROD for

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				exclusive hiker use, than to lose Emerald-Heather and Hyalite trails for motorized use.		the final decision on "time shared" routes.
Todd Orr		840		Flanders Creek Trail - too short to recognize motorized benefits without additional trail work. Suggest closing to motorized or leave as is, and leave undeveloped to secure a remote trail experience for hikers.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M would not add this old trail into the motorized trail system. It would be available as a dispersed recreation opportunity for non-motorized uses.
Alex Phillips		1483a		The preferred alternative includes a proposal to close Hyalite Road each spring from March 30 - may 15 to provide an opportunity for biking and rollerblading on a paved road without motorized traffic. I fully support this proposal and think this is a great idea. I often go to Yellowstone Park for an opportunity like this.	Hyalite	This opportunity is included in Alt 7M
Alex Phillips		1483a		I think plowing it to the reservoir would be great, but plowing to any major landmark, such as Langohr campground, would open up lots of winter opportunities for cross-country skiers.	Hyalite	This opportunity is included in Alt 7M
Andy Copeland		1245		Trail 171 should be managed for hiking and mountain biking.	Hyalite	This opportunity is included in Alt 7M
Andy Copeland		1245		Expand the route options from the South Cottonwood trail. It is a great trail, but all non-motorized users are confined to one route. Manage trail 422 (connecting to Langohr roads) and trail 169 (Wheeler Gulch) for hiking, biking and stock.	Gallatin Crest	This opportunity is included in Alt 7M
Christian Klatt		1374	Bozeman	I am excited by the prospect of having Hyalite Road # 62 plowed for winter use yet limiting motorized traffic to lands below the reservoir. This allows for quiet winter recreation opportunities for those of us who can't afford a snowmobile. I highly encourage this elements of alternative six!	Hyalite	This opportunity is included in Alt 7M. Refer to the ROD for the final decision.
Todd Goertzen		411	Bozeman	I strongly feel that all areas accessed via the Leverich Canyon trailhead and accessible to the trailhead from the Moser Road be closed to motorized vehicles. The area is narrow, steep and pristine and not conducive to motorized use without those users doing significant damage. Regardless of the travel planning process - I feel these areas should be addressed as soon as possible.	Hyalite	The Leverich Canyon Trail is proposed to be managed for foot, stock and mountain bike travel only in the preferred alternative 7M.
Todd Orr		840		213 - West Shore Hyalite Reservoir - Easy access and heavy foot travel. Suggest posting and managing as non-motorized.	Hyalite	This opportunity would be occur in Alt 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Todd Orr		840		213 - Crescent lake - Easy access and heavy foot travel. Suggest posting and managing as non-motorized.	Hyalite	This opportunity would be occur in Alt 7M.
Loren Blanksma		1194		To close Blackmore trail (423), History Rock trail (424), Crescent Lake Trail (213), Westshore trail (431), and East Fork Divide trail (171) in addition to the already closed Palisade Falls trail to motorized would provide a significant amount of non-motorized area in the Hyalite drainage. However the other roads (62, 3163, Langohr roads 1046, 6963, Moser roads - 3159, 3161, 3160) and trails (Hood Lick trail 436, Wildhorse trail 456, Horse Lick Trail 457, Lick Creek trail 455, East Fork Hyalite 434, Hyalite 427) should remain open to motorized as planned in Alt 7.	Hyalite	The preferred alternative 7M would manage trails in the Hyalite area much as you suggest in your comment. Please see the summer motorized maps.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 79 - Pioneer Lake - motorized - Summer and Winter - Leave open - fun, trails for the family.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 101 - Mica Mine - Motorized - Summer and Winter - Leave open - Family, great view.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 163 - Lake of the Pines - Motorized - Summer and Winter - Leave open - Family, great view, fun, fishing, wildlife.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 185 - Squaw Creek - Motorized - Summer and Winter - leave open - Family fun, fishing, camping, wildlife.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 416 - Rat Lake - Motorized - Summer and Winter - Family, fun, camping, view, fishing.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.
Joe Polus		1487		We discussed the Squaw Divide 417/421 ATV Loop Opportunity - This is a good area to focus ATV use - there is a high density of old logging roads in this area that all cater to ATVs.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		185 - Squaw trailhead to Hyalite Peak - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use. Longer single track trails such as this are very important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride. Also an important route for many mountain bikes connecting to Hyalite Creek. ATVs may attempt to extend the single track trail, but is unlikely due to steep switchback topography.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		425 Lime Creek - manage as is for motorized use.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		419 - Mica Creek Loop - manage as is for motorized use.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Todd Orr		840		417 - Squaw/Bear Divide - Suggest reopening trail loop down 421 Telephone Ridge to motorcycles to create a loop ride back to Squaw Creek.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		416 - Rat Lake - manage as is for motorized use.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		188 - Swan to Moose - Manage as is for motorized use.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		76 Swan - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use and loop in the Swan Creek drainage or access to Squaw Creek.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.
Will Robertson		304	Bozeman	I like that ATV use is emphasized in the Gallatin Roaded area. This area has many abandoned logging roads perfect for ATVs and few trails which hikers, mountain bikers, and equestrians have an interest in using. It makes sense.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		163 - Lake of the Pines. Manage as is for motorized use. Consider re-routing sections within damaged riparian areas or with high erosion.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M. Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Squaw Divide 417/421 ATV Loop Opportunity - this is a good area to focus ATV use - there is a high density of old logging roads in this area that all cater to ATVs.	Gallatin Crest	This opportunity would occur in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		186 - Swan Creek below 163 - Manage as is for motorcycle use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	Gallatin Crest	This opportunity would occur in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		82 - Windy Pass - Suggest managing 82 as closed from the trailhead to Windy Pass Cabin and to intersection with 96 south of the cabin. Open 187 to motorcycle to allow access from Portal or Moose Creek to the Gallatin Crest. This leaves the Windy Pass/Golden Trout lakes trailhead non-motorized and reduce many possible conflicts, while keeping a motorcycle access and loop to the Crest trail 96.	Gallatin Crest	This opportunity would occur in Alt 7M.
Loren Blanksma		36		Trail #187 (Tamphrey Creek) is a good motorized trail that is not used by hikers.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would occur in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		Old Windy Pass Trail - Suggest signing at intersection on 82 and manage as closed to reduce confusion and allow un-needed trail to grass over.	Gallatin Crest	This old trail would be closed to motorized use under the preferred alternative. Your suggestion of restoring/removing this old route is a good one, and will be considered after implementation of the travel plan decision in a separate decision.
Todd Orr		840		186 - Swan Creek above 163 - Manage as is for motorcycle use. Consider re-routing sections within damaged riparian areas or with high erosion.	Gallatin Crest	This opportunity would occur in Alt 7M. Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						would assist in compliance.
Todd Orr		840		186 - Swan Creek above 188 - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use and access to the Crest Trail 96. Consider Trail maintenance in a few areas along upper end of trail.	Gallatin Crest	This opportunity would occur in Alt 7M. Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Todd Orr		840		187 - Tamphery to Windy Pass Cabin - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use to allow an alternative access from Portal or Moose Creek to the Gallatin Crest trail 96. Suggest signing and managing the Windy Pass/Golden Trout lakes trailhead and trail 82 as non-motorized. This reduces many possible conflicts with the high non-motorized traffic, while keeping a motorcycle access and loop to the Crest. Suggest installing a few more trail markers or cairns where necessary. Suggest considering a very short trail relocation to connect 187 with 96 a few hundred feet north of the Windy Pass Cabin to eliminate any motorized activity or disturbance near the cabin.	Gallatin Crest	The configuration you suggest is the configuration being considered in the preferred alternative. The trail relocation suggestion you note is a good one and will be considered at a future date.
Todd Orr		840		199 - Elkhorn Ridge - Manage as is for motorcycle use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	This opportunity would remain available in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		1 - Buffalo Horn - Manage as is for motorcycle use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	This opportunity would remain available in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		160 - Upper Porcupine above 34 -Manage as is for motorcycle use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	This opportunity would remain available in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		160 - Porcupine from Ramshorn Lake to 1 - Manage as is for motorcycle use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride. Post signs in areas with horse damage reminding stock riders to stay on developed route to reduce vegetative destruction and soil compaction. Look at possible re-route to avoid wet, boggy areas.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	This opportunity would remain available in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		534 - BFT - Middle Cottonwood to Truman - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	West Bridgers South	This opportunity would remain available in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		534 - BFT - Truman to Ross Pass - manage as is for motorized use.	West Bridgers South	This opportunity would remain available in Alt 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Todd Orr		840		534 - Ross Pass to Corbly - manage as is for motorized use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	West Bridgers South	This opportunity would remain available (open to motorcycles) in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		586 - Middle Cottonwood - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle travel. Sign and close to ATV use to prevent further extension of ATV trail on a single track trail.	West Bridgers South	This opportunity would remain available in Alt 7M. No ATV use in the West Bridger South Travel Planning Area would be allowed in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		535 Truman - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use. Suggest signing and closing to ATV use to prevent further extension of ATV trail on a single track trail. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	West Bridgers South	This opportunity would remain available in Alt 7M. No ATV use in the West Bridger South Travel Planning Area would be allowed in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		79 - Pioneer Lakes Ridge - manage as is for motorized use.	Gallatin Roaded	This opportunity would continue in Alt 7M.
Joyce Conners		135	Bozeman	Another thought on the west side of the Bridger's- close Middle Cottonwood to motorized and let motorized access to the Foothills trail be at Truman Gulch and going North only.	West Bridgers South	This option was considered in the EIS. In Alt 7M, the West Bridgers would be managed for non motorized recreational opportunities south of Middle Cottonwood. Bridger Foothill Trail #534 would be closed to motorized use south of Middle Cottonwood and north of Limestone trails. Foothills Trail #534 from the "M" parking lot would be closed to motorized use to address user conflicts.
Anne Banks	BWAGS	1177	Bozeman	Management here seems appropriate: relative remoteness, low population density and demand, and checkerboard ownership patterns make emphasis on horse and pack stock use a good option.	North Bridgers	This proposed management plan would be applied under Alternative 7-M.
Greg Beardslee		737		I draw the line at ATVs because they have changed the trail character on Emerald into a road, and Hyalite has begun the transformation too. In the seven years that I have been riding up Hyalite, the width of the trail has almost doubled, bye-bye single-track.	Hyalite	This route would be closed to ATVs in Alt 7M. Refer to the ROD for the final decision and rationale for it.
Greg Beardslee		737		In the last 3 years ATVs have been riding all the way to Hyalite Lake. I am OK with motorcycles coming and going on both Hyalite and Emerald trails, but I draw the line at ATVs because they have changed the trail character on Emerald into a road, and Hyalite has begun the transformation too.	Hyalite	This route would be closed to ATVs in Alt 7M. Refer to the ROD for the final decision and rationale for it.
Todd Orr		840		Suggest closing 194 to all motorized use from trail 83 to 66. This leaves the Windy Pass/Golden Trout Lakes trailhead non-motorized and reduces possible conflicts. Alternative routes could be available for motorized access from Portal Creek to the Crest via	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	This segment of trail #194 would remain open to motorized use in Alt 7M. If the Forest observes user conflicts, additional management restrictions may be considered in the future.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				187 and to Porcupine via 66.		
Loren Blanksma		1194		The motorcycle closure of the Gallatin River trail (137) is acceptable to provide a hiking trail for fishermen.	Gallatin River Canyon	This trail #137 has not been managed for motorized use and would be managed as non motorized in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		137 - River trail between Squaw Creek and Lava Lake Trailhead: Suggest managing as a non-motorized fishing access and river-side hike or mountain bike.	Gallatin River Canyon	This trail #137 has not been managed for motorized use and would be managed as non motorized in Alt 7M.
Tony Rasch		221	Bozeman	Middle Cottonwood canyon is the most popular hiking trail on the West side of the Bridgers.	West Bridgers South	This trail is currently managed for multiple use. This opportunity would remain available in Alt 7M.
Todd Orr		840		424 - History Rock - Suggest managing as open to motorcycle or implement alternating-day motorcycle use to reduce possible conflicts and satisfy both non and motorized groups. Well signed trailhead with alternating day motorized explanation is very necessary.	Hyalite	This trail is currently open to motorized to motorized use but In Alt 7M it would be managed to provide a non motorized winter and summer opportunity on the east side of Hyalite drainage..
Gary Reysa		1119	Bozeman	The Sypes Canyon Trail has become a lot less desirable over the past few years due to the increase in the number of very high speed descents by bicycle riders. This has become a real hazard to the people hiking this trail (particularly children).	West Bridgers South	This trail is managed for non motorized recreational use. It would continue to offer these non motorized opportunities in Alt 7M. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Todd Orr		840		34 - Lower Porcupine to Onion Basin - Manage as is for motorcycle use. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	Porcupine Buffalo-Horn	Trail 34 would be managed as open to motorcycles to it's junction with trail 160 in the preferred alternative. The Onion Basin portion of trail #34 would be managed for non motorized recreation, and to provide secure grizzly bear core habitat.
Todd Orr		840		Iron Mountain road 2551 / Wepler Cabin Cutoff - suggest managing as open to motorcycle use and creating a great loop ride form the Iron Mountain road 2551 through the Deer Creek area. Suggest signing, closing an managing as closed to ATV to prevent poaching of single-track trail system.		This trail is proposed to be managed this way in Alternative 7M.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 43 - Swamp Lake Trail - Motorized - Summer leave open - good place to explore, has a lake, etc.		This trail is proposed to be restricted to motorized use because of a lack of public access. This will prevent neighboring landowners from using the public's land in a manner that they do not allow general public to.
Todd Orr		840		46 - Twin Cabin - Suggest sign and managing as closed to motorized use to prevent conflicts with high horse use	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	This trail would remain closed to motorized use in Alt 7M. Resource damage would be corrected through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would also be applied to help gain compliance.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Stuart Jennings		1021	Bozeman	Emerald Lake: it is unreasonable to allow use by horses or motorcycles in areas where the trailhead parking facility has no room for trailers.	Hyalite	This trailhead facility is planned for enlargement to accommodate more parking including trailers in our ongoing Hyalite Capital Improvement Program. Facilities issues are being addressed separate from the travel planning process.
Todd Orr		840		Moose Creek ATV user-made trail - Suggest signing and manage as closed to motorized use to prevent further extension of user-made trail.	Gallatin Roaded	This user built route is not being carried forward in Alt 7M, this route would be closed to motorized use. Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Todd Orr		840		Moose Creek Karst user made - Suggest signing and manage as closed to motorized use to prevent further extension of user-made trail.	Gallatin Roaded	This user built route is not being carried forward in Alt 7M, this route would be closed to motorized use. Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		West Bridger Trail 129: recreationists from east of Big Timber would use this access and reduce pressure from other areas by dispersing travel.		Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridger area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the Jims' Gulch Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area.
Franklin A. Smith MD		778	Bozeman	…Emerald Lake…almost run over by a motorcycle..A mountain bike rounded a corner silently and almost ran us over as well. …feel its unsafe…	Non-Motorized (General)	To begin to deal with user conflicts on this trail, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Will Robertson		304		As a biker, I am in support of alternating biking days on the Hyalite and East Hyalite (Emerald Lakes) trails. Only one suggestion: I think it would be important to include one weekend day as an open day, so that all the locals who have "real jobs" Monday through Friday would have an opportunity to ride the trails. Also, there are many people who travel from places like Boise, Billings, etc. for an	Gallatin Crest	To begin to deal with user conflicts, the Forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				extended weekend of biking in Bozeman, and for those people an open weekend day would be essential.		
Linda Ellison		1070		How many motorcycles actually go into Emerald-Heather in a day, or up the Hyalite Peak trail? Are ATVs using the trail? I know there are a lot of Bozeman riders who are like us and just plain don't go there more than once every two or three years anymore. Why close it if only a handful of riders a week go there? I know there are a lot of people there on weekends, but how about during the week? Or how about a short season for motorized access limited to the month of August - mid September?	Hyalite	To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Robert and Mary Fellenz		1010	Bozeman	Hyalite and Emerald Lakes are becoming so crowded it is dangerous to allow any type of motorized traffic on them. Even bike and horseback traffic can be hazardous at times.	Hyalite	To begin to deal with user conflicts, the forest is considering staggered use (alt 7M), the timing of which would be developed after the decision in collaboration with the different user groups (refer to the ROD). Resource damage would be rehabilitated through normal maintenance. Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.
Craig Kenworthy		826	Bozeman	The Buffalo Horn Pass Trail #120 should be closed to motorcycles. If the Bear Canyon Area warrants a closure, due to resource conditions (even if that is temporary), then this area qualifies for restoration and non-motorized use.	Porcupine Buffalo-Horn	Trail #120 is currently open to motorized use. It would remain open to motorcycle use in Alt 7M. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
Larry Ellison	Bitterroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Keep the mile of #525 near Ross Peak open to motorcycle use. #534 and # 525 aren't too useful without the connection.	North Bridgers	Trail #525 east of its junction with the Middle Fk. Brackett road would be restricted to motorized travel due to wildlife mitigation included in the Bridger Bowl Ski Area Expansion Decision. It restricts year round motorized use except on the South Fork Road (summer only). There will be motorcycle access to Ross pass from the new South Fork Brackett Access road, to the west along trail #525. Please see the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Loren Blanksma		36		Trail #83 to Golden Trout Lake is a good destination trail	Gallatin Roaded	Trail #83 would be closed to motorized use in Alt 7M. Although the area is managed to emphasize roaded, motorized opportunities, this will provide the sole non motorized high lake recreation opportunity in the Gallatin Roaded area.
Paul Herbel		927	Bozeman	Golden Trout should stay open as it makes for a fun, short, technical ride.	Gallatin Roaded	Trail #83 would be closed to motorized use in Alt 7M. Although the area is managed to emphasize roaded, motorized opportunities, this will provide the sole non motorized high lake recreation opportunity in the Gallatin Roaded area.
Todd Orr		840		Golden Trout Lakes - Suggest signing, closing and managing as closed to all uses.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Trail #83 would be closed to motorized use in Alt 7M. Although the area is managed to emphasize roaded, motorized opportunities, this will provide the sole non motorized high lake recreation opportunity in the Gallatin Roaded area.
Loren Blanksma		1194		Golden Trout Lake trail (83) should be left open to motorcycles as a good destination trail. I support the preferred alternative plans to leave Buffalo Horn-Porcupine trails (1, 199, 466, 34, 160, 120, 179, 194, 66) open to motorcycle use.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Trail #83 would be closed to motorized use in Alt 7M. Although the area is managed to emphasize roaded, motorized opportunities, this will provide the sole non motorized high lake recreation opportunity in the Gallatin Roaded area. The Buffalo Horn Porcupine loop trails would remain open to motorcycle use in Alt 7M. The portion of Trail #34 from the junction of #160-#34 to the Gallatin Crest would remain closed to motorcycle use.
Doug Poehls		718		Trail #156 to interconnect the northside of #2 and #5.		Under Alternative 7- M Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) will be open to motorcycles.
Doug Poehls		718		Trail 2 by Clover Basin should be opened so there are alternative trails from trailhead 2606 and multiple trails into the Custer Forest and to tie Deer Creek and East Boulder areas together.		Under Alternative 7-M Boone's Peak Driveway Trail #2 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.
Doug Poehls		718		Trail #2 the whole trail length needs to be accessed to create the interconnects for the loop system.		Under Alternative 7-M Boone's Peak Driveway Trail #2 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.
Joe Polus		1487		Trail #2 - needs a little waterbar work on switchback area - a possible joint trail maintenance venture for this summer - Bill stated this work would not constitute keeping trail #2 open or closed in the final alternative.		Under Alternative 7-M Boone's Peak Driveway Trail #2 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The north end of the Boone Peak Driveway trail 92) is a narrow, technical single track ridge trail that should remain fully open.		Under Alternative 7-M Boone's Peak Driveway Trail #2 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.
Wayne Moore		1443		I'd like to see the Boone Creek Trail #2 left open to motorized recreation, as there's so few trails left now. With the use Lower Deer Creek gets, eliminating it		Under Alternative 7-M Boone's Peak Driveway Trail #2 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				would be taking away from a great number of people the pleasure they've had enjoying this area.		
Loren Blanksma		1194		The Derby Mountain trail - I could understand closing the north half of this trail (126) but the south half to the Forest boundary should motorcycle single track opportunity.		Under Alternative 7-M Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail.
Doug Poehls		718		Trail #124 to provide an additional access Trailhead for OHV use on the west side of this forest area. And to interconnect with the Custer Forest to the east.		Under Alternative 7-M Lodgepole Trail #124 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The Lodgepole trail is a good loop connector trail between Elk Creek road and Lower Deer Creek trail and it should remain entirely open to motorcycles.		Under Alternative 7-M Lodgepole Trail #124 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail.
Todd Orr		840		124 - Elk Creek - Suggest managing as open to motorcycle use to provide access to Deer Creeks and East Boulder loops. These longer single track trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.		Under Alternative 7-M Lodgepole Trail #124 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail.
Todd Orr		840		124 - East half Wepler Cabin - Suggest managing as is - open to motorcycle use. Suggest posting signs for ATV closure at Myers Creek trailhead and manage as closed to ATV to prevent poaching of single track trail system.		Under Alternative 7-M Lodgepole Trail #124 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail.
Todd Orr		840		2 - Elk Mountain south of 108 - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use. Suggest minor trail work to make reasonably motorcycle-accessible and create loop to the East Boulder. Conflict unlikely due to low use by all.		Under Alternative 7-M Lodgepole Trail #124 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The section of Lower Deer Creek trail south of the Deer Creek cabin that is proposed to be closed is the most beautiful trail in the entire Deer Creek area and needs to remain open to motorcycles.		Under Alternative 7-M Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The Middle Fork of Upper Deer Creek trail (112) is a connector trail between the West Fork of Upper Deer Creek trail and the Boone Peak Driveway trail and it too should remain open to motorcycles.		Under Alternative 7-M Middle Fork #112 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.
Todd Orr		840		112 - Middle Fork Upper Deer Creek - Suggest managing as is - open to motorcycle use for great technical loop with low user conflicts.		Under Alternative 7-M Middle Fork #112 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.
Justin Eyre		1272	Billings	The Placer Gulch access is a great trail for beginners. This area is easily accessed with good roads and an adequate load/unload area. It is my firm opinion that the FS would be making a terrible mistake by closing this area (ATVs).		Under Alternative 7-M Placer Gulch Trail #256 is proposed to be open for ATV', from it's start to its' junction with Lower Deer Creek Trail #5.
Todd Orr		840		256 - Placer Gulch - Suggest managing as is - open to motorcycle use.		Under Alternative 7-M Placer Gulch Trail #256 is proposed to be open for ATV', from it's start to its' junction with Lower Deer Creek Trail #5.
Doug Poehls		718		Trail 156 from Bear Gulch should be open to Tomato Canyon to be able to complete a loop of the northwest section of Deer Creek area.		Under Alternative 7-M Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) will be open to motorcycles.
Todd Orr		840		156 - East Tomato Can gulch - Suggest managing as open to motorcycle single track use. Suggest posting signs for ATV closure at each end before it becomes an ATV trail unless decision is made to create an ATV loop.		Under Alternative 7-M Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) will be open to motorcycles.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Todd Orr		840		156 - Red Mountain/West Fork Upper Deer Creek - Suggest minor trail work on 20' section 1 mile west of road 482 to fix a steep, sidehill washout. Keep this trail open to motorcycle use to access some great technical riding opportunities with long loops and few other users. Conflicts unlikely due to low use by others. These longer single-track trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.		Under Alternative 7-M Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) will be open to motorcycles. Commenter makes a good specific suggestion regarding trail maintenance needs.
Doug Poehls		718		Trail #20 going to the west of Picket Pin Mountain should remain open. It is the only single track, and ATV trail, other than 117, that is on this plateau. It is also the only trail that connects to the Meyers Creek area to make a loop from the plateau into the Deer Creek Area.		Under Alternative 7-M the Blacktail Creek Trail #20 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.
Kathleen Murphy		1451	Bozeman	Please provide at least one trail system (on each access side of each range) that eliminates all mechanical vehicles permanently. My preference would be to have the Middle Cottonwood, South and Middle Brackett Creek trails closed to all but stock and foot traffic. These trails would give both skiers and hikers a quiet corridor into the Bridgers.	West Bridgers South	Under Alternative 7-M the Bridger Mountain range would managed for multiple uses including both motorized and non-motorized trails. The "M" trail system would be closed to all uses except hiking. Seasonal restrictions would also be employed.
Todd Orr		840		126 - Derby Ridge - Suggest managing as is - open to motorcycle use. These longer single-track trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride. Very low use by all makes conflicts unlikely.		Under Alternative 7-M the Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail.
Doug Poehls		718		Trail #205 needs to be extended to allow access all the way through to the Custer Forest. It is currently a very good and well maintained ATV trail to Moccasin Lake and then single track on down to Meyers Creek Ranger Station on the Custer Forest. With Trail #20 joining it at Blacktail Creek where you have proposed to have it closed.		Under Alternative 7-M the Dry Fork Road is proposed to be open to full size vehicles to where the road becomes a trail on the east side of Section 7, then is open to ATV's to a point just west of Moccasin Lake where the trail becomes single track, and then open to motorcycles to its' junction with Trail #2. This provides the widest range of recreational opportunities given the capability of the resources. The Custer National Forest has requested that motorized use is not directed from the Gallatin onto the Custer Forest in this area.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Judy A. Rue	Sweet Grass County Recreation Association	1123		Leave Graham Creek Trail #117 open to motorcycles. They are really about the only ones that use it and are the only ones that keep it cleared. Leave SQ 2 open to ATVs.		Under Alternative 7-M the Graham Creek Trail #117 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Graham Creek Trail 117 segment one: this trail from the Main Boulder Road to the junction with the Picket Pin road is steep and technical with many switchbacks. Very few people ever use this trail especially for motorized use.		Under Alternative 7-M the Graham Creek Trail #117 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.
Larry Ellison	Bitterroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Keep the Gish trail #117 open to motorcycles. It'd a good way to access Placer Basin from the Main Boulder.		Under Alternative 7-M the Graham Creek Trail #117 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.
Wayne Moore		1443		I'd like to see Graham Creek Trail #117 left open to motorcycles and section 2 open to ATV's. Because of the tough going on this trail, it will never be overused.		Under Alternative 7-M the Graham Creek Trail #117 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.
Todd Orr		840		117 - Graham Creek - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use. An incredible access and views along the plateau and very long loop out the Dry Fork of East Boulder. Very little use by all, so conflicts would be unlikely. Closure would likely be ineffective due to easy access from private mining claims on top of the plateau. Closure would then allow access and use by only those with mining claims in the area. Longer trails such as this one are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride. Suggest installing trail markers in areas where trail is faint.		Under Alternative 7-M the Graham Creek Trail #117 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.
Loren Blanksma		1194		Green Mountain trail (94) and Graham Creek trail (117) should remain open to motorcycle use.		Under Alternative 7-M the Graham Creek Trail #117 is proposed to be open to motorcycles. Green Mountain Trail is proposed to be non-motorized use only to prevent conflicts with use of the Natural Bridge Recreation Area.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The preferred Alt closes the few viable motorcycle trail opportunities that exist here (Grouse Creek trail 14, Green Mountain trail 94, Graham Creek trail 117). I have ridden Grouse Creek trail and it appeared to be a low impact single track trail that does not trespass the AB Wilderness. These trail (94, 14, 117) all provide good connector loop trails between the East, West, and Main Boulder Roads.		Under Alternative 7-M the Graham Creek Trail #117 is proposed to be open to motorcycles. Green Mountain Trail is proposed to be non-motorized use only to prevent conflicts with use of the Natural Bridge Recreation Area. The Grouse Creek Trail is a heavily used non-motorized route, primarily because of it's access to the nearby caves.
Doug Poehls		718		Trail #117 on current map that goes west from Chrome Mountain to the Boulder River needs to be		Under Alternative 7-M the Graham Creek Trail #117 is proposed to be open to motorcycles. The terrain the trail

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				managed not only for horses but also OHV use. This will also give another option to accessing this area to reduce pressure coming from the Custer Forest to the east.		goes through prohibits reconstruction to an ATV standard.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Green Mountain Trail 94: this trail provides a connection from the Main Boulder to the East Boulder and access to the Deer Creeks area		Under Alternative 7-M the Green Mountain Trail is proposed to be non-motorized use only to prevent conflicts with use of the Natural Bridge Recreation Area.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Green Mountain trail # 13 should be kept open. It makes a cut across from East Boulder area to Main Boulder.		Under Alternative 7-M the Green Mountain Trail is proposed to be non-motorized use only to prevent conflicts with use of the Natural Bridge Recreation Area.
Todd Orr		840		14 - Main Boulder Cave Fork: Right fork of 14 to Boulder Dave - Suggest managing as closed to motorcycle use at intersection with 14. Short, unnecessary one way ride becomes impassable as you near the caves.		Under Alternative 7-M the Grouse Creek Trail #14 is proposed for non-motorized use.
Bill Griffin		138	Billings	Deer Creek cabin from cabin trail 5 to trail 124 to 108 to and including trail 2 should be left open.	Deer Creeks	Under Alternative 7-M the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be open to motorcycles from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use.
Ed Melcher		1431a	Billings	The snow pack stayed around longer than normal and we were unable to properly document the road you are missing on top of the Iron Mountain are Brass Monkey. So since you do not have all the trails and roads on maps we will assume you will leave these open.		Under Alternative 7-M the Picket Pin Road (FR#140) is proposed to be open to full-size vehicles; the existing mining roads on the East Boulder Plateau are proposed to be open to ATV's; and the Graham Creek Trail #117, and Blacktail Creek Trail #20 are proposed to be open to motorcycles. The Dry Fork Road is proposed to be open to full size vehicles to where the road becomes a trail on the east side of Section 7, then is open to ATV's to a point just west of Moccasin Lake where the trail becomes single track, and then open to motorcycles to its' junction with Trail #2. This provides the widest range of recreational opportunities given the capability of the resources.
Todd Orr		840		13 - Dry Fork East boulder - Suggest keeping open to motorcycle for incredible access and views along the plateau and very long loop out the Main Boulder. These longer single track trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.		Under Alternative 7-M the Picket Pin Road (FR#140) is proposed to be open to full-size vehicles; the existing mining roads on the East Boulder Plateau are proposed to be open to ATV's; and the Graham Creek Trail #117, and Blacktail Creek Trail #20 are proposed to be open to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Suggest closure signing at Squaw Pass divide.		motorcycles. The Dry Fork Road is proposed to be open to full size vehicles to where the road becomes a trail on the east side of Section 7, then is open to ATV's to a point just west of Moccasin Lake where the trail becomes single track, and then open to motorcycles to its' junction with Trail #2. This provides the widest range of recreational opportunities given the capability of the resources.
Ron Thomas		985	Big Timber	The trails in the East Boulder area are in good condition and are easy to maintain b/c of the rocky base to the trails. Suggestion: put a seasonal closure to ATV and motorcycle use from 11/15 to 4/15. This would reduce impact damage during wet season. Trail #117 from Chrome Mtn to Boulder River needs to be managed for horses and ATVs. This will give another option to access this area and reduce pressure coming from the Custer NF to the east. Trail #20 going from Picket Pin Mtn should remain open. It is the only single track and ATV trail, other than #117, that is on this plateau. It is the only trail that connects to the Meyers Creek area to make a loop from the plateau. Extend the East Boulder trail #205 to allow access all the way through to the Custer NF.		Under Alternative 7-M the Picket Pin Road (FR#140) is proposed to be open to full-size vehicles; the existing mining roads on the East Boulder Plateau are proposed to be open to ATV's; and the Graham Creek Trail #117, and Blacktail Creek Trail #20 are proposed to be open to motorcycles. The Dry Fork Road is proposed to be open to full size vehicles to where the road becomes a trail on the east side of Section 7, then is open to ATV's to a point just west of Moccasin Lake where the trail becomes single track, and then open to motorcycles to its' junction with Trail #2. This provides the widest range of recreational opportunities given the capability of the resources. The Custer National Forest has requested that motorized use is not directed from the Gallatin onto the Custer Forest in this area. The suggestion of a seasonal closure is an interesting one, however, experience has shown that generally in the area, resource damage doesn't occur during these dates, because of the rocky and hardened condition of the trails.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Swamp Lake Trail 43: with permission through private property this drainage would provide an excellent access for snowmobiling from the East side of the crazies.		Under Alternative 7-M this trail is proposed to be restricted to motorized use because of a lack of public access. This will prevent neighboring landowners from using the public's land in a manner that they do not allow general public to.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Swamp Lake Trail 4 3: with permission through private property you can ride to the lake for fishing opportunities.		Under Alternative 7-M this trail is proposed to be restricted to motorized use because of a lack of public access. This will prevent neighboring landowners from using the public's land in a manner that they do not allow general public to.
Catherine R. Brandon		584		I would like to see Swamp Lake #43, Smelter and Rock Lakes #220 - 270 stay open because this would allow further accessibility for motorized recreationalists to fish or just enjoy the scenery.		Under Alternative 7-M this trail is proposed to be restricted to motorized use because of a lack of public access. This will prevent neighboring landowners from using the public's land in a manner that they do not allow general public to. Ron needs to address Smeller and

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Rock Lakes).
Todd Orr		840		20 Placer Basin - Suggest managing as is for motorcycle use. An incredible access and views along the plateau and very long loop out the Dry Fork of East Boulder. Very little use by all, so conflicts would be unlikely. Closure would likely be ineffective due to easy access from private mining claims on top of the plateau. Closure would then allow access and use by only those with mining claims in the area. Longer trails such as this one are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride. Suggest installing trail markers in areas where trail is faint.		Under Alternative 7-M Trail #20 is proposed to be open to motorcycles.
Doug Poehls		718		Trail #108 because it is the main connection between #2 and #124.		Under Alternative 7-M West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The small section of the West Fork of Upper Deer Creek Trail (108) that is closing to motorcycles is simply a short connector route that prevents the rider from climbing a ridge in order to access Lower Deer Creek trail 95). This trail should remain open to motorcycles		Under Alternative 7-M West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does.
John Vehrs		1595		Deer Creek trail is a favorite trail of many motorcycle riders and add great looping opportunities. Please consider this area for motorcycle use.		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motor vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles.
Elizabeth Shuler		1041		Continued motorized use is important motorized users do the majority at maintenance and clearing in the Deer Creeks and East Boulder trails.		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motor vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the Jims' Gulch Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use.
Doug Poehls		718	Laurel	The areas I am interested in are the East Boulder and Deer Creek areas of the Big Timber Ranger District. Being from the Billings area this is one of the closest areas to go to enjoy OUR National Forests. One of the things I like about this area are all the different ways you can get into the forest to enjoy it. There are many access points currently either through Big Timber or from the east side through the Custer Forest. You need to keep those access points open to OHV use by the development of a good loop trail system. Both of these areas in your preferred travel plan will not have any good loop systems. And the East Boulder area excludes OHV use. OHV users need a longer trail than do hikers. A good system that addresses loop trails with interconnect trails between the loops would be the best solution for this area and very easy to accomplish with the present trail system.		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the Jims' Gulch Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. In addition, most of the mining roads on the East Boulder Plateau will be left open to ATV's.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Tomato Canyon Trail 156 segment three: this section of trail from Iron Mountain Road 482 to Lower Deer Creek 5 is very important for the whole loop of trails 2, 156, 5, and 124 with variations of 108 and 112. These trails combined in different directions are the heart of looping opportunities in the Deer Creeks.		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the Jims' Gulch Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be open to ATV's from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. Graham Creek Trail #117 will remain open to motorcycle use under Alternative 7-M.
Loren Blanksma		36		Deer Creek trails (#2, #112, #124, #5, #128, #117) are lightly used and should not be closed because there is little or no user conflict.		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the Jims' Gulch Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be open to ATV's from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. Graham Creek Trail #117 will remain open to motorcycle use under Alternative 7-M.
Anton Miller		154	Laurel	A loop road in the Deer Creek area would be nice. I would like to see more motorcycle trail widened to be	Deer Creeks	Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				ATV accessible.		motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the West Bridger (Jims' Gulch) Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use.
Don Cowles		900	Bozeman	I own property on the west side of the Boulder River. Motorized vehicles should not be limited or eliminated. My family always allows others to ride or drive motorized vehicles across our property. Each individual should have as much access to the forest regardless of whether they are walking, riding or driving. Most of my travel is limited to 4 wheelers. After 3 surgeries on my right knee and surgery on my left ankle, this 62 yr old body cannot hike the trails it used to.		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the West Bridger (Jims' Gulch) Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use.
John Vehrs		1595		Boulder area south of Big Timber is an area that should be considered for a motorcycle friendly zone. Hikers and other user groups are rarely encountered within this region. The single-track opportunities are great for motorcyclists.		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the West Bridger (Jims' Gulch) Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use.
Loren Blanksma		36		There has never been a serious options of significantly expanding other areas for motorcycle use. There are many areas (East Boulder, Main Boulder, Gardiner, Mill Creek) where the increased restrictions are completely unwarranted because they eliminate the few motorized opportunities currently present in areas that are surrounded by non-motorized wilderness. I think that the Deer Creek area illuminates that the true agenda of this new travel plan is to eliminate motorized use from the GNF as possible in one step. The Forest Service declared Deer Creek as very conducive to motorized use, and then process to recommend completely ridiculous trail closures in this area.		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the West Bridger (Jims' Gulch) Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use.
Ron Thomas		985	Big Timber	Keep Cherry Creek trail # FR206 open. It is an excellent access that allows access to the West Fork trail #108. Keep all of trail #108 open. It allows access to the interior of this area as well as access to #124 to Wepler Cabin and the Custer NF. Keep all of trail #2 open. It provides for excellent scenery and challenges. It accesses the high plateaus to the south. When combined w/ Cherry Creek FR206 and West Fork #108 and Tomato Can #156 it is a premier motorcycle full day loop. Keep trail #124		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				open. It connects Deer Creek and the West Fork as well as Wepler Cabin. It allows users an eastern access via Meyers Creek as well as a quicker access to the higher elevations. Keep Tomato Can #156 open b/c it is fun and allows connections to 3 different big loop systems. Keep Derby Ridge #126 open. It is one of the most challenging in the area. It gets limited use due to its challenges. Keep Tie Cutter Gulch, Jims Gulch and Placer Gulch open for loop access.		does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the West Bridger (Jims' Gulch) Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
trish Kerby		145		I would really like to see more loop (for ATV travel) roads- especially in the Deer Creeks area		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the West Bridger (Jims' Gulch) Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						#256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use.
Loren Blanksma		1194		I do not understand why so many trails are proposed to be closed in the description section. I see no reason to close any motorcycle trails in this area. The travel proposals do not make sense because they eliminate all loop trail possibilities and also isolate West Bridger from accessing the remainder of the Deer Creek area.		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the West Bridger (Jims'

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Gulch) Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. Overall for this area, opportunities are being provided where the trails and other resources can best accommodate their uses, while providing for the widest variety of recreational opportunities.
Loren Blanksma		1194		Tomato Canyon trail, Cherry Creek road, Iron Mountain road, Lower Deer Creek trail, should remain open because they are good single tracks.		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the West Bridger (Jims' Gulch) Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. Overall for this area, opportunities are being provided where the trails and other resources can best accommodate their uses, while providing for the widest variety of recreational opportunities.
Loren Blanksma		1194		All the other roads should remain open to motorized. This area is not heavily used because it is not an alpine environment, so motorized use should not be precluded in any way.		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the West Bridger (Jims' Gulch) Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. Overall for this area, opportunities are being provided where the trails and other resources can best accommodate their uses, while providing for the widest variety of recreational opportunities.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Saul and Lisa Heinemann		197	Big Timber	Also I would specifically like to see the road opened at least to 4 wheelers that used to run between Upper Deer Creek and Cheery Creek area. I am disabled since a serious back injury and can no longer ride horses or hike so my only way to get around in the mountains is by 4 wheeler, snowmobile, or pickup truck.		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the West Bridger (Jims' Gulch) Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						#256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. Overall for this area, opportunities are being provided where the trails and other resources can best accommodate their uses, while providing for the widest variety of recreational opportunities.
Kenneth Schilling		1530	McLeod	I live south of McLeod, between East Boulder River and Elk Creek. My ranch has the Hubble Forest Allotment. My neighbor has the allotment with the Wepler Cabin. There are important trails to leave open; 124, 112, 5. These trails are important for cattle movement and for access to the Custer National Forest.		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point) to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be constructed to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						West Bridger area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the Jims' Gulch Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use.
Rick Reed		1864a		I would like all trails in the Deer Creek system left open to ATV use. It is a very popular recreation area and should be enjoyed by motorized ATV use.		Under Alternative 7M, FR#206 will remain open to all motor vehicles; West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Red Mountain Trail #156 (including Tomato Can Gulch) and Boone's Peak Trail #2 will be open to motorcycles. Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail. Derby Ridge Trail #126 will be open to motorcycle use from its' start to it's junction with and including the upper end of the Derby Gulch Road system. It will be restricted to all motorized use above this point (to the south of this point)

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						to prevent "deadheading" motorized use in a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest. In addition, it appears from the district rangers' ground inspection of this portion of the trail that little if any motorcycle use has or could occur on this portion of the trail. Tie Cutter Gulch connection trail will be proposed for construction to an ATV trail standard to allow a motorcycle and ATV loop opportunity connecting the West Bridge area and the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and the Placer Gulch Trail # 256. This negates the need to have motorized route on the West Bridger (Jims' Gulch) Trail # 129, which is not suited, due to unstable geology, to accommodate motorized use (in fact, a very serious ATV accident occurred on this trail resulting in the quadriplegia of the rider in 2003). Leaving Jims Gulch non-motorized will provide a non-motorized access into the Lower Deer Creek Area, while preventing the need for expensive reconstruction activities in this unstable area. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use. Overall for this area, opportunities are being provided where the trails and other resources can best accommodate their uses, while providing for the widest variety of recreational opportunities.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Lodgepole Trail 124 segments 3 and 4: this trail continues southeast past Dead Indian Creek Trail 83 to Myers Creek Ranger Station. It creates numerous looping opportunities to relieve access pressures from the few remaining areas.		Under Alternative 7-M, Lodegepole Trail #124 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail.
Doug Poehls		718		Trail 124 by Wepler Cabin should continue to the west to connect into the trailhead at 2606 and also to continue northwest into trail 108. Also trail 124 should continue east into the Custer Forest to		Under Alternative 7-M, Lodgepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				access their trail system.		motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Deer Creek Trail 5 segment three: another crucial connecting trail in the area to provide looping opportunities and access to reduce return travel trails.		Under Alternative 7-M, Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 from the its' junction with Trail #156 to its' junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 will be open to motorcycles to provide a motorcycle loop connection with the Red Mountain Trail #156, and because of the number of creek crossing in this area that will be cheaper and less impactive to harden for motorcycle use as opposed to ATV use. Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 will be open to ATV's from it's junction with the Placer Gulch Trail #256 south to the Deer Creek Cabin. Because of unstable tributary stream crossings on the trail south of the cabin, coupled with need to prevent "deadheading" of motorized use to a non-motorized area on the Custer National Forest and the need to provide a small non-motorized experience in the Deer Creek Mountains, Alternative 7-M restricts this portion of the trail to non-motorized use
Robin Taylor		169	Laurel	Alternative 7 Summer motorized. In speaking will Bill Avey, this travel plan that as much as I can tell is leaving all old mining trails open to ATV use and is a great idea.		Under Alternative 7M, most of the mining roads on the East Boulder Plateau, which this discussion referred to, will remain open to ATVs.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 423 - Blackmore - Motorized - Summer - Older trail for short hikes or riding to view the mountains, challenge trail.	Gallatin Crest	The Blackmore Trail would be managed for non-motorized recreation use in the preferred alternative. Most other routes in Hyalite would be available for summer motorized uses - please see the summer motorized map.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Ross Peak Trail 525: this trail is important as it has been cleared and maintained for years by motorcyclists and is the only single-track trail from Brackett Creek connecting to the Bridgers Foothills trail 534 via Ross Pass.	Fairy Lake	Use of the 525 trail east of the Middle Fork/South Fork road would be restricted to non-motorized uses due to wildlife mitigation included in the Bridger Bowl Ski Area Expansion Decision. The relocated S Fork Road allows motorized access to the Ross Peak Trail for motorcycles to travel to the west side of the Bridgers and onto the Foothills trail system north of Middle Cottonwood (please see the summer motorized map).
Pat Meyers		1101		Do not close the road from Stillwater to Lake Abundance. Lake Abundance is a unique destination that is accessible and rewarding to both the most avid outdoors person and a family with young children who want to make the trip just for	Cooke City	We agree that the Stillwater Road provides good, relatively easy access for families wanting to hike to Lake Abundance.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				family fishing and a picnic.		
Mark Shyne		775	Bozeman	Additional trail signing and user education would assist in compliance.	West Bridger North	We agree.
Charles Sumner		611	Cooke City	The sidehill south of Long Lake is full of springs and is too wet to support a road. The area is mostly healed from the old road use and would be a mistake to reopen that road.	Cooke City	We appreciate your comment and will consider it when making a final decision.
Chris Anderson		128	Bozeman	I talked to you (Jose) about snowmobiling up Hyalite. If motorcycles are allowed in the Gallatin Crest - Hyalite trail #434, E fork Hyalite #427 hyalite in the summer then why not snowmobiles in the winter. Low impact on the area especially 4 strokes snowmobiles. Maybe just open one of the trails at a time. Maybe just to 4 strokes. Maybe certain days at a time.	Gallatin Crest	Balancing winter uses in the Hyalite area proved to be very challenging. Alternatives 1-3 evaluated managing the "high country" of the Hyalite area for snowmobiling. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to access the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork to provide access to Heather/Emerald Basin, ice climbing and rental cabins. The bulk of the Hyalite drainage including Hyalite Creek and Peak area would be managed as closed to snowmobiles to provide high quality non-motorized recreation opportunities. No alternative considered limiting snowmobile use to "best available technology" low emission machines, nor considered in detail a time share component for winter use. Please see the Record of Decision and Decision maps for the final winter configuration in Hyalite.
Marlene Renwyck		496	Livingston	We hike in the Tom Miner area a lot during the summer and would like to be able to enjoy the area in the winter also free from snowmobiles; furthermore it is important wildlife habitat being so close to the Park.	Tom Miner Rock	We respect your opinion.
John and Carole Oldemeyer		839		We urge the FS to re-evaluate the opening date for road use by wheeled vehicles and horses. While we don't support use of roads still soft and wet from winter snow, we believe that a July 1 date would be environmentally acceptable most years. When that is not the case, the roads could be closed temporarily until they are dried and hardened.	Cooke City	Alternative 7M proposes seasonal restrictions for roads and trails in the Cooke City Area. Generally, roads and trails would be open to motorized vehicles from June 15 - Dec.2. Please see the Detailed Description of Alternatives for a route by route description of proposed seasonal restrictions. In extremely wet or snowy years, roads and trails can be temporarily restricted longer as needed.
Charles Sumner		611	Cooke City	I suggest that in lieu of the "loop road" that GNF realign and bridge the Stillwater steam crossing along the southern boundary of section 4. Thus the access could continue to the existing trailhead to lake Abundance.	Cooke City	We will look at alternatives to reduce sedimentation in the Stillwater during the summer of 2006.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Charles Sumner		611	Cooke City	I suggest that in lieu of the "loop road" that GNF realign and bridge the Stillwater steam crossing along the southern boundary of section 4. Thus the access could continue to the existing trailhead to lake Abundance.	Cooke City	We will look at alternatives to reduce sedimentation in the Stillwater during the summer of 2006.
Judy A. Rue	Sweet Grass County Recreation Association	1123		Keep all of trail #108 open as it allows for access to the interior of this area as well as access to #124 to Wepler Cabin and the Custer NF.		West Fork Trail #108 will be open to motorcycles to its' junction with the Middle Fork Trail #112. At this point, the trail will be closed to all motorcycle vehicles because of the impacts in the narrow canyon to the multiple creek crossings along this trail section. The Middle Fork Trail #112, in connection with Trail #2 will be open to motorcycle use and provide loop opportunities and access to the same area that the restricted portion West Fork Upper Deer Creek #108 does. Lodgepole Trail #124 will be open go motorcycles to its' junction with the connector trail to the Iron Mountain road system. This will allow access to the Wepler Cabin area, but maintain non-motorized opportunities to the Lower Deer Creek Trail #5 and prevent motorcycle use from "dead-heading" on the Custer National Forest, where motorized restrictions are planned for the Meyers Creek/Lodgepole Trail.
Loren Blanksma		1194		I do not object to closing the Ross Peak Trail to motorcycles if the Fairy Lake trail, Honeymoon trail, and the Bridger Foothills trail are left as technically challenging single track motorcycle opportunities. This would leave the entire southeast side of the Bridger Range in addition to the Fairy Lake area trails as non-motorized. The remaining roads should all be left as motorized routes.	Fairy Lake	What you are calling the Ross Peak trail is Trail #525 and is restricted due to wildlife mitigation included in the Bridger Bowl Ski Area Expansion Decision. It restricts year round motorized use except on the South Fork Road (summer only). There will be motorcycle access to Ross pass via a new connector trail. The three other trails mentioned in your comment will remain open to motorcycles and the Fairy Lake trail (trail #500) will also be an ATV opportunity to Fairy Lake.
Tony Jewett and Tim Stevens	National Parks Conservation Association Northern Rockies Regional Office	1452		This region just north of YNP provides important habitat for park wildlife in all seasons, as the DEIS notes. We request that any proposed action assure that no additional access points are considered for the Sawtooth, and that it be secured for non-motorized use only during all seasons.	Sawtooth	While the Forest Service will continue to pursue options to gain public access into the Sawtooth area as opportunities arise, all travel plan alternatives maintain the Sawtooth Travel Planning Area as a non-motorized area.
George F. Hoffman		1335	Belgrade	In the Fairy Lake winter portion of the travel plan, I would prefer that the trail to Ross Pass remain open. It is the only access which would allow viewing of the west side of the Bridgers.	Fairy Lake	Winter motorized travel into the Ross Pass area is restricted due to wildlife mitigation included in the Bridger Bowl Ski Expansion decision. There would be limited snowmobile "high marking & play" area opportunities near up to Ross Peak in Alt. 7M off of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						designated routes.
Paul D. Herbel		1330		Is the Squaw Creek trail up to Hyalite Lake from Hwy 191 open to bikes or not? This is a most enjoyable trail to ride on as it allows access to the north end of the crest trail without having to go up to the Hyalite Reservoir and deal with crowds and people hiking to Grotto Falls, Hyalite Lake, etc.	Gallatin Roaded	Yes, it currently is open to mountain bikes and would remain open in Alt 7M
Joe Lawellin		13		It seems counter productive to increase game fees when we have limited access to the game. Find a way to open up some of the troubled over populated game areas to hunters earlier in the season (not later as the game is not in prime eating condition later) and make the tags for does only.	Access	Management of big game populations, and associated hunting regulations, are under the jurisdiction of Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, not the U.S. Forest Service. Therefore this comment is not within the scope the proposed travel management plan.
Ron Thomas		985	Big Timber	As a member of the volunteer fire department from Big Timber I find the usage of logging roads and 4-wheel trails helpful in fighting fires by being able to access areas.	Access	The proposed travel management plan decision (any alternative) would not limit the Forest Service to allow wheeled motorized cross-country travel for any fire, search and rescue or law enforcement operation.
Eva Patten	BWAGs	468	Gallatin Gateway	The arbitrary spring closure of trails is a problem for the dude ranchers. They need to be using the trails by early June and in many years this is not a problem.	Access	We assume that this comment is related to proposed blanket spring restrictions on the use of stock. Based on public comments received, Alternative 7-Modified limits the proposed spring stock restrictions to specific routes where it is known that trail damage from horses can be a problem. The Forest Supervisor was convinced by comments suggesting that blanket restrictions were not necessary across the Forest. Better information and education is a preferable approach at this time. Also, in addition to trail protection, part of the rationale for proposing blanket spring restrictions was to establish clearer understanding of when trails would be open. Public comment received did not support this reasoning.
Dan Sucrease		127	Big Sky	I don't want to see closure of the trails to stock before June 15th. Summer is too short in Montana as it is. At least consider limited closure of some trails that are prone to damage.	Access	Based on public comments received, Alternative 7-Modified limits the proposed spring stock restrictions to specific routes where it is known that trail damage from horses can be a problem. The Forest Supervisor was convinced by comments suggesting that blanket restrictions were not necessary across the Forest. Better information and education is a preferable approach at this time. Also, in addition to trail protection, part of the rationale for proposing blanket spring restrictions was to establish clearer understanding of when trails would be open. Public comment received did not support this reasoning.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Capital Trail Vehicle Association	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	5	Helena	Reasonable alternatives built around the existing level of motorized recreational opportunities and enhanced levels of motorized opportunities are not getting any significant consideration in the process. The process seems to be a pre-determined to close as many motorized trails as possible.	Alternatives	Chapter 2 of the DEIS and the FEIS describes the process that was used to develop the alternatives considered for a travel management plan. One objective of the range of alternatives was to sharply define the issues. Early analysis showed, in general, that impacts vary with the level of human use, particularly motorized use. Therefore, a criterion for the alternatives was to provide a range that would also vary in terms of the amount of motorized opportunities provided.
Capital Trail Vehicle Association	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	5		Adequate consideration would include the development of reasonable alternatives to mitigate the significant loss of motorized opportunities by closures in the GNF and surrounding national forests. Reasonable alternatives would also include enhancement of existing opportunities where feasible, and the planning of new motorized opportunities to meet the growing needs of motorized recreationists.	Alternatives	Chapter 2 of the DEIS and the FEIS describes the process that was used to develop the alternatives considered for a travel management plan. Alternative 1, which represents the management of travel as it was in 1999, and allows for off-route summer motorized travel, was determined to be sufficient in representing the more motorized end of the range of alternatives. It should be noted however that this did not mean that new motorized routes could not be considered within the other alternatives. Alternatives 3 and 4, in particular, include some motorized routes that are not available today.
Marty Malone		103	Pray	The FS forgot one important alternative. That alternative should be a zero use alternative. Since you are eliminating all uses except hikers, lets consider keeping them off also since they have the same impact on cutthroat trout.	Alternatives	Chapter 2 of the DEIS and the FEIS describes the process that was used to develop the alternatives considered for a travel management plan. Given that travel planning is designed to assess and ultimately manage human access and travel within the Forest, the possible options range from unregulated/unmanaged use across the Forest to prohibiting all human use and travel. These two extremes were considered unreasonable. There was no identified significant issue that would compel an alternative to shut all humans out of the Gallatin National Forest.
Kerry White		1616		CBU believes the FS has not followed NEPA. NEPA requires that a no action alternative be provided to the public for comparison. The FS has failed to provide the public with an accurate no action alt. CBU requests a no action alternative that is accurate and includes a complete and comprehensive trail inventory. The FS has stated that Alt 2 is the no action alt. This is false. Closures are shown in Alternative 2 that do not exist at this time.	Alternatives	It is correct that NEPA requires consideration of a no action alternative. The procedural approach the Forest used to meet this requirement is discussed in Chapter 2 of the DEIS and the FEIS. In general, the no action alternative for travel planning would mean not to adopt a travel plan. However, even if a travel plan were not adopted, that does not mean that the status quo is maintained. The types of use and volume of use will change and the Forest Service would continue to respond to problems through site-specific actions. Changes can also occur through actions taken outside of the control of local land managers. These, and other

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						factors led the Forest Service to develop two alternatives to closely represent possible "no action" scenarios; Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Alternative 1 is based on the direction contained on the 1999 Gallatin National Forest Recreation Visitor Map. It reflects the type of uses that would be legal across the Forest at that time. Alternative 1 allows for off-route summer motorized travel thereby accommodating motorized use of possible routes that may not be mapped or on the inventory. Alternative 2 was developed to closely reflect the current situation and what would likely occur through site-specific management decisions. The types of uses allowed on routes in this alternative were based not only on what is currently legally open, but also on an estimate of which routes are currently capable of accommodating those uses.
Timothy L. Ravndal	Montana Multiple Use Association, Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1032		The preferred alt by the FS would provide a gross reduction in the level of motorized access and recreation while the needs of the public and the history and culture of the area are just the opposite. We request that the preferred alt be redone so that it is in better touch with the needs and existing use of the project areas.	Alternatives	A large number of commenters shared the view that Alternative 7 was far too restrictive on motorized uses. On the other hand there were a large number of commenters with the view that Alternative 7 was not restrictive enough. One criterion for developing the 7 alternatives studied in detail was to provide options and a basis of comparing various levels of motorized use in order to reach an informed decision.
Mark P. Hoffman		1337	Clyde Park	With regards to chosen alternative 7: I feel the DEIS was written to support the pre-decided closures. I do not feel that the Forest Service took a good hard look at the best available science and other information to determine the best management practices for the Gallatin.	Alternatives	A large number of commenters shared the view that Alternative 7 was far too restrictive on motorized uses. On the other hand there were a large number of commenters with the view that Alternative 7 was not restrictive enough. One criterion for developing the 7 alternatives studied in detail was to sharply define the environmental issues to allow for a good comparison of effects and trade-offs within the EIS. The information contained in the DEIS was used in identifying Alternative 7 as the preferred alternative. The information contained in the FEIS will be used in making the final decision.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619	Helena	The DEIS and preferred alternative contain many underlying fundamentals that are out of touch with reality and very troubling. For example, the alternative preferred by the Forest Service would produce a gross reduction in the level of motorized access and recreation while the needs of the public and the history and culture of the area are just the opposite. We request that the preferred alternative	Alternatives	A large number of commenters shared the view that Alternative 7 was far too restrictive on motorized uses. On the other hand there were a large number of commenters with the view that Alternative 7 was not restrictive enough. The EIS compares the effects, including effects to recreation opportunities, of a range of alternatives that vary in the level of motorized use opportunity that would be provided. The Record of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				be redone so that it is in better touch with the needs and existing use of the project areas.		Decision will document the final decision of the Forest Supervisor and the rationale for the choices made.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		The process and preferred alternative has been directed to benefit wildlife at the expense of motorized recreationists. Wildlife populations are at all time highs. Hunting is satisfactory and is declining in popularity. Motorized recreation is growing in popularity. We request that the preferred alternative be redone so that it recognizes that wildlife are doing great and provides more emphasis to multiple-use recreational opportunities.	Alternatives	A large number of commenters shared the view that Alternative 7 was far too restrictive on motorized uses. On the other hand there were a large number of commenters with the view that Alternative 7 was not restrictive enough. The EIS compares the effects, including effects to recreation opportunities and wildlife, of a range of alternatives that vary in the level of motorized use opportunity that would be provided. The Record of Decision will document the final decision of the Forest Supervisor and the rationale for the choices made.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		The DEIS and preferred alternative have been directed to separate out every different forest visitor on the pretense that "user conflicts" are significant. There is virtually no documentation of user conflict in the Gallatin national Forest. Additionally, it is grossly wrong to reward intolerant and non-sharing attitudes with the majority of the opportunities in the forest. We request that the preferred alternative be redone so that it is in better touch with the needs and existing use of the project areas.	Alternatives	"User conflict" was not a major factor in the identification of a preferred alternative in the DEIS. In this travel planning process user conflict has been considered a behavioral issue that is more of a problem with the individuals involved than it is with different user groups. Once a travel plan decision is made, the objective is to provide better information so that everyone knows the types of uses to expect on given routes, thus mitigating unexpected encounters that may lead to conflict. That being said, in identifying the preferred alternative for the DEIS, there was a desire to provide some front-country hiking, horseback and mountain bike riding opportunities in a non-motorized setting, but this was not based on some pretense to separate users.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		The FS preferred alternative includes an excessive amount of segregation. This approach encourages forest visitors to be intolerant of others and would establish a very bad precedent for forest visitors. Alternative 7 and the segregation that it represents is a complete over-reaction to any perceived visitor use conflict and does not promote the most important principle that we have for public lands and that is sharing with all members of the public. We request that the preferred alternative be redone so that it is in better touch with the needs and existing use of the project area.	Alternatives	"User conflict" was not a major factor in the identification of a preferred alternative in the DEIS. In this travel planning process user conflict has been considered a behavioral issue that is more of a problem with the individuals involved than it is with different user groups. Once a travel plan decision is made, the objective is to provide better information so that everyone knows the types of uses to expect on given routes, thus mitigating unexpected encounters that may lead to conflict. That being said, in identifying the preferred alternative for the DEIS, there was a desire to provide some front-country hiking, horseback and mountain bike riding opportunities in a non-motorized setting, but this was not based on some pretense to separate users.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems	353		You have failed to consider an adequate range of alternatives due to a lack of criteria for managing	Alternatives	Chapter 2 of the DEIS and the FEIS describes the process that was used to develop the alternatives

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Council			wildlife habitat and populations. Due to the absence of any wildlife standards in this Forest Plan amendment, the agency has not taken a "hard look" at the consequences of the various proposed alternatives. If you have no threshold levels to identifying significant resource problems, then these problems will not be addressed in your alternatives.		considered for a travel management plan. The EIS addresses 15 identified wildlife/fishery related issues in terms of the predicted environmental effects of the alternatives. In addition, there are proposed goals, objectives, standards and guidelines under consideration for wildlife (see Chapters I and II of the Detailed Description of Alternatives). It should be noted however that considering a reasonable range of alternatives is not contingent on the inclusion of standards.
Brian Hawthorn	Blue Ribbon Coalition	1196		Routes in "open" areas, which existed in 2001, were created when cross-country travel was legal and must be incorporated into the analysis in order to satisfy NEPAs requirement for the no action alternative.	Alternatives	It is correct that NEPA requires consideration of a no action alternative. The procedural approach the Forest used to meet this requirement is discussed in Chapter 2 of the DEIS and the FEIS. In general, the no action alternative for travel planning would mean not to adopt a travel plan. However, even if a travel plan were not adopted, that does not mean that the status quo is maintained. The types of use and volume of use will change and the Forest Service would continue to respond to problems through site-specific actions. Changes can also occur through actions taken outside of the control of local land managers. These, and other factors led the Forest Service to develop two alternatives to closely represent possible "no action" scenarios; Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Alternative 1 is based on the direction contained on the 1999 Gallatin National Forest Recreation Visitor Map. It reflects the type of uses that would be legal across the Forest at that time. Alternative 1 allows for off-route summer motorized travel thereby accommodating motorized use of possible routes that may not be mapped or on the inventory. Alternative 2 was developed to closely reflect the current situation and what would likely occur through site-specific management decisions. The types of uses allowed on routes in this alternative were based not only on what is currently legally open, but also on an estimate of which routes are currently capable of accommodating those uses.
Russ Ehnes	MTVRA	837		The starting benchmark was only a fraction of the existing motorized roads and trails in use by the public. "No Action" would be the choice of the motorized community with adjustments and corrections. The actual routes on the ground should be included on the maps. The USFS has often states	Alternatives	It is correct that NEPA requires consideration of a no action alternative. The procedural approach the Forest used to meet this requirement is discussed in Chapter 2 of the DEIS and the FEIS. Alternative 1 is based on the direction contained on the 1999 Gallatin National Forest Recreation Visitor Map. It reflects the type of uses that

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				it has neither the time nor the money to do an inventory, nor was it ever their intention to do so. However there was a route inventory information collected by the USFS that was not considered or included in the planning process. The study done with photo's and GPS coordinates was not incorporated into the DEIS. The 2001 3-state OHV EIS decision eliminating the use of ATV's on single-track trails should be included in Alternative 1, since it is in effect. Alternative 1, no action, has been altered in the DEIS and does not reflect the actual current condition. It ignores the existing routes on the ground. It also ignores the 2001 3-state OHV EIS decision of the ban on cross country travel as an existing condition.		would be legal across the Forest at that time. Alternative 1 allows for off-route summer motorized travel thereby accommodating motorized use of possible routes that may not be mapped or on the inventory. In earlier comment periods for the proposed Travel Plan, the Forest Service specifically asked the public if they knew of non-Forest Service system routes, not shown on our maps, that they believed should be included. While there were many comments suggesting that the Forest Service conduct a complete inventory of all roads and trails that may be out there, there were very few comments identifying specific routes. The study work that the commenter refers to was done as part of the Forest's ongoing monitoring of OHV use and was not done for the Travel Plan. This information was reviewed but no specific routes were identified that stood out as good candidates to add to the travel planning process for a motorized use opportunity. In response to the last point, we did not elect to include the off-route motorized travel prohibition of the Montana-Dakota OHV decision in Alternative 1 for several reasons, one of which is that it allows for analysis of effects of an option that would allow summer motorized travel off of designated routes. The Montana-Dakota OHV decision does allow Forest Supervisors to consider opening specific areas to off-route motorized travel.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The Wilderness Society is troubled by the number of changes proposed to the Forest-wide goals, objectives, standards and guidelines in the DEIS and we encourage you to defer these changes until the Forest Plan is revised and the changes can be analyzed in the broader context of forest planning. Of particular concern is your proposal to drop road density standards from the FS Plan. The use of road density standards to measure cumulative impacts of roads on wildlife is widely accepted as the best tool for measuring wildlife security. We strongly urge the GNF to adopt road density standards on the model of Targhee National Forest. It is critical to continue to monitor road densities on the BMU subunit level, so that cumulative effects of new and existing roads and motorized trails do not compromise grizzly bear habitat security.	Amendments	Refer to the purpose and need in Chapter 1 and Appendix A of the EIS for a discussion of the reasons that amending forest-wide goals, objectives, standards and guidelines is proposed. As a point of clarification, programmatic management direction of the Forest Plan, such as "road density standards" are not intended to dictate measurement criteria for evaluating impacts of proposed actions. Forest Service biologists would agree that evaluation of open motorized route density is a very good tool for measuring wildlife habitat security. Amendment of the Forest Plan to remove these standards would not change that.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Hank Rate		1038	Gardiner	Revision of the Forest Plan in this process is unacceptable. The public is diverted by the road by road and trail by trail analysis and the overarching issue of motorized vs. non-motorized recreation. Such a plan revision MUST be deferred until the mandated revision of the Forest Plan is addressed.	Amendments	Refer to the purpose and need in Chapter 1 and Appendix A of the EIS for a discussion of the reasons that amending forest-wide goals, objectives, standards and guidelines is proposed. The Forest Service recognized that the travel planning process was large and complex and that's part of the reason that longer and extra comment periods were provided. Also, in the information provided to facilitate comments, including the DEIS, the agency tried to be clear on the scope of the decision to be made, including amendment of Forest Plan level programmatic direction.
David Keltner	Bear Creek Council	1366	Gardiner	We believe that amendments to the forest plan should occur only during the forest planning process. The method, placement, and subsequent public discussion surrounding the amendments during this process have been "hidden" under the mass of "trail by trail, road by road" information. Replacement of concrete, measurable standards with statements of good intention fail to meet the requirements outlined by NEPA.	Amendments	Refer to the purpose and need in Chapter 1 and Appendix A of the EIS for a discussion of the reasons that amending forest-wide goals, objectives, standards and guidelines is proposed. The Forest Service recognized that the travel planning process was large and complex and that's part of the reason that longer and extra comment periods were provided. Also, in the information provided to facilitate comments, including the DEIS, the agency tried to be clear on the scope of the decision to be made, including amendment of Forest Plan level programmatic direction. The proposed travel plan does not address the management of other resources that typically are addressed in a forest plan revision process. Because of the complexity, the agency elected to address it separately from other controversial programs such as timber management, livestock grazing, and fuels reduction. Including travel planning in the revision process would only make that process more complicated.
David Keltner	Bear Creek Council	1366		Elk Habitat Effectiveness Index-this science based standard has been used for over 20 years in the grizzly bear recovery effort. At this time of possible delisting, it makes little sense for the Forest Service to remove the road habitat protections for this threatened species. Using the Habitat Effectiveness Index, or a science based alternative, is a requirements under NEPA. By eliminating the scientific analysis of routing density from travel planning the U. S. Forest Service violates NEPA. Bear Creek Council agrees that the U. S. Forest Service should use the best research/scientific standards. The travel planning process should come	Amendments	Refer to the purpose and need in Chapter 1 and Appendix A of the EIS for a discussion of the reasons that amending forest-wide goals, objectives, standards and guidelines is proposed. As a point of clarification, programmatic management direction of the Forest Plan, such as "road density standards" are not intended to dictate measurement criteria for evaluating impacts of proposed actions. Forest Service biologists would agree that evaluation of open motorized route density is a very good tool for measuring wildlife habitat security. Amendment of the Forest Plan to remove these standards would not change that.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				after the forest plan is revisited and revised.		
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		How can you have two Forest Plan amendments that address the same issues? We are confused about this Forest Plan amendment, that includes new direction for both the lynx and grizzly bear, and how it relates to the multi-forest forest plan amendments that are being completed for these species. Which amendment takes priority? The administrative relationship between these various forest plan amendments needs to be clarified. Since neither the multi forest or travel plan amendments address how the new direction will impact grizzly bears, would the public challenge both, or just one, for a lack of disclosure of environmental impacts?	Amendments	Direction that can change how national forests are managed can come from a number of different sources and at different points in time. In addition to the proposed amendments for lynx and grizzly bear that the commenter refers to there are changes in laws, regulations, policy, case law and other direction occurring during the life of the Gallatin Forest's travel planning process. It's no wonder that one can be confused. That being said, the proposed multi-forest amendments for lynx and grizzly bear and the proposed Gallatin Forest Travel Management Plan are all distinct processes. The interested public should comment on (challenge) each independently of the other. For the proposed travel plan the final Record of Decision will describe the specific decisions made and they should be distinct from those being addressed in the multi-forest amendments for grizzly bear and lynx.
David Bechberger		738		My third concern is that the travel plan is written in such a way that trails can be added/rerouted in the near future without a hassle. I am particularly interested in the possibility of making/improving a connector trail from Chestnut Mountain (459) to Bear Canyon (440).	Bear Canyon	The proposed travel management plan does not make the final decision for future construction of trails. The design and specific route location would be subject to future analysis under NEPA. The decisions made through the Travel Plan determine the appropriate uses for that route if and when construction would be proposed. In other words, during the site-specific analysis for proposed trail construction, the issue of whether the route should be open or not to particular conveyances (e.g. ATV's, motorcycles, etc.) will have already been decided.
Ken Zahn		1634		Designation of Modes of travel etc. - A definition of summer and winter is needed in the EIS.	Document	This was a good suggestion and definitions of summer and winter use have been added to the glossary. For the purpose of travel planning, “summer use” refers to travel by passenger car, high-clearance 4X4, ATV, motorcycle, bicycle, horse and foot. In other words those recreation activities that generally occur outside the winter months. In contrast “winter use” refers to snowmobiling, cross-country skiing and snowshoeing.
Ken Zahn		1634		Development of a monitoring plan associated with travel management - describe the past history of the Forest's actions in monitoring the types of activities discussed in Appendix B.	Document	The Forest Service does not believe that providing a description of the past history of the Gallatin Forest's monitoring program within the FEIS would be useful to the decision for a travel management plan and therefore did not incorporate this suggestion.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
William and Carol Oriel		288	Cooke City	The EIS was not made generally available as a physical document, and the awkward digital format is difficult for us to use and understand. As homeowners we were never notified of this proposal, but instead found out late, upon recent arrival in Cooke City. We will be directly affected and believe that more effort should have been and should be used to reach affected parties, like ourselves. Cost is not an excuse for poor communication.	Document	The Forest Service made extensive efforts to inform the public of opportunities to comment throughout the travel planning process. For those who did not get on the mailing list, the option was available to obtain a copy of the DEIS on CD or in hard copy.
Kirk D. Walton		10	Wilsall	I am opposed to the FS accepting and counting "Canned Responses" generated by various pressure groups in many instances. The FS has cited numerous responses as evidence that a particular view is correct. If a person is not concerned enough to create his or her own response and merely parrots the line issued to them, I cannot believe they are viable comments.	General	The Forest Service has repeatedly said that the travel plan decision is not a vote. It's the substantive points of the comments, not the number of times they were repeated that the agency looked for during the 3 comment periods.
Ben Erickson		11	Belgrade	My next point concerns comments submitted by Mr. Kirk Hewitt. Mr. Hewitt submitted an extensive comment documentation that was initially ignored. Only after inquiry, did Mr. Hewitt learn that his comments had been left on an office floor. There may be others who had comments left out, that did not check or did not have the diligence of Mr. Hewitt to follow up. Honest mistakes do happen, and it is possible that this was the case regarding Mr. Hewitt's comments. However, considering the extent, detail and volume of this comments, I'm inclined to think otherwise. It is difficult to over look a 100-page document. I am curious to know if any of the extensive comment documents submitted by environmental groups were misplaced until followed up on.	General	Mr. Hewitt was one of the most active participants in the travel planning process. His time and effort was extraordinary. He discovered that his comments seemed to be missing after he was provided a CD containing all comments received during that comment period. After he contacted us, we discovered that he had hand-delivered his comments to us in a box that also contained petitions. We were also using boxes to sort comment letters by date and also to separate petitions, mass-mailings, etc. from the substantive comments. Inadvertently, the box that Mr. Hewitt brought in became the box where petitions were placed. The error was corrected and his comments were included in the project file.
Ben Erickson		11		The point is regarding the two-year trail inventory compiled by Todd Orr that was not used in formulating preferred Alternative Seven. As I understand it, failing to use this inventory is in violation of Forest Service policy. When the 3 state OHV rule was imposed a few years ago (further restricting off trail riding) the MTVRA supported this action with the stipulation that an accurate and comprehensive trail inventory be taken before further closures could occur. This has not been done and	General	Ongoing monitoring work that has been conducted by Forest Service employee Todd Orr was used for analysis purposes in the EIS. Non-system routes he identified were not used on the maps because the national protocol for travel planning is to begin with Forest Service "system" roads and trails. Other routes can be considered as additions to this baseline.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				as we see on the GNF that after inventorying trails, the results are not being used.		
Alfred McGuire		25		After this new travel plan is in effect, if you (FS) need volunteer help to repair the tore up trails, please let me know. I'll be glad to help get rid of these scars and help make our forest pretty again.	General	Volunteer help is appreciated. Please contact the ranger district office that is most convenient for you and ask about projects and programs that are available.
Kerry White		1616		The Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act must be adhered to. Any attempt by the Forest Service to close areas outside of designated wilderness to multiple use goes against this Act. CBU believes that a preconceived agenda has been initiated against multiple use. The MWA has stated that an agreement was made in August of 2004 that will protect the GNF. CBU would like to know what this statement means and what agreement was made between MWA and the FS.	General	There is no provision in the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960 (P.L. 86-517) that precludes the Forest Service from establishing restrictions on motorized vehicle travel. Section 4 of the Act defines "multiple use" as follows: "'Multiple Use' means the management of all the various revewable surface resources of the National Forests so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the needs of the American people; making the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions; that some land will be used for less than all of the resources; and harmonious and coordinated management of the various resources, each with the other, without impairment of the productivity of the land, with consideration being given to the relative values of the various resources, and not necessarily the combination of uses that will give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output" [id. at Sec. 4(a)].
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		We recommend that the FS adopt a policy in the final travel plan that no new recreational technology will be allowed on the forest until the agency has had an opportunity to determine the appropriateness of the use, study the anticipated impacts, and determine if, where or how such recreation should take place. If the new type of recreational technology is determined to cause damage or conflicts with other uses, the agency has the authority and should use it, to prohibit such new use on forest lands altogether.	General	The Travel Management Plan authorizes off-road vehicle travel for snowmobiles, ATVs, motorcycles and mountain bikes. The Glossary and Standard A-9 of Alternative 7-M provide definitions for these vehicles. The Travel Management Plan does not authorize off-road travel for any vehicle that does not meet these definitions.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	One of our major concerns is the number of project and administrative roads in many TPA's. In some drainages, those roads are targeted for obliteration or restoration. In most drainages, there is no mention of them. It seems as if there must be some consistency for how these roads are dealt with. Travel planning is the right time to address this	General	All roads, not otherwise designated through the Travel Management Plan for public or administrative use, are targeted for effective closure and decommissioning. See Objectives D-1, D-5, D-6, D-7 and G-1 under Alternative 7-M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				issue.		
Thomas H. Gibson		1289	Bozeman	While conflicting uses have always existed, the tolerance of others seems to be declining, thus escalating the perceived need to create an ours and theirs ownership to the forests.	General	It is our hope that establishment of a travel plan will help resolve some of the user conflict issues by providing clear expectations. We believe that there is less chance for users to have diminished experiences, and thus conflict, if they know what to expect in terms of the other uses managed for on a chosen trail
Brad Grein	Citizens For Balanced Use	1302		Everyone will agree that there are problems associated with travel in the forest. The answers do not lie in closures, in proper management regulation	General	In using the term "closures" we assume the commenter is referring to motorized use restrictions. The Forest Supervisor has identified 4 criteria that will be used in making the Travel Management Plan decision. Two of these criteria recognize that trails open to motorized use do not also provide the type of experience most non-motorized users are looking for. This was part of the reasoning for identifying a preferred alternative that would provide a mix of motorized and non-motorized trail opportunities.
Elsa Howard		1348	West Yellowstone	I greatly object to any further impact on the trail systems by motorized vehicles and would like to see it further reduced if not eliminated altogether. The impact on public grounds is increasing to the point that limits have to be imposed. The impact is also greatly affected by the desire of commercial entities to use our forest for profit with little regard for the effect it is having. This includes horse outfitters that think they're commercial operations should take precedence over others using the forest.	General	Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of publication of the FEIS, does reduce the number of routes open to motorized travel. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's rationale for use restrictions. User behavior and attitudes were not used as reasons for restrictions.
Robb Larson		1391		The Forest Service should be proactive in planning and providing for a location where users can site in guns or target shoot, plink, etc. There are several areas in the Bridgers and in the Hyalite drainage that have seen excessive use for this activity and need to be cleaned up, made safer if this use is to continue. One possibility would be to provide earth berms as effective backstops for shooting in one or two relatively safe locations, and close other areas in high-use drainages (specifically Hyalite) from gun use.	General	We appreciate the suggestion and each district ranger can consider whether this might be something they wish to propose. However, the idea of a shooting range is not within the scope of this Travel Plan analysis and decision and therefore is not included within the range of alternatives.
Josh O'Neill		1468	Livingston	My dad taught me that when you meet a hiker or a skier on the trail you pull over and shut whatever you are riding off and let them go by you before you start back up and ride on. This would be a good law	General	Courteous behavior can go a long way toward preventing diminished recreation experiences and conflict among users. However it does not address certain resource issues nor does it sufficiently provide for

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				instead of the travel plan.		the desired experiences of many non-motorized recreationists. Therefore, Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative at the time of this FEIS preparation, does include motorized route restrictions. The Record of Decision explains the rationale for these use restrictions.
Alaina Lammer Knight		629	Bozeman	Close and rehabilitate all user created trails. These trails are illegal and their continued use should not be honored.	General	It was not necessarily illegal prior to the Travel Management Plan decision to travel on user created trails. It depended on when the trail was established and the type of use that had been occurring on it. The Montana-Dakota OHV decision (USDA, January 2001) restricted wheeled motorized travel to existing routes that had been receiving such use. It did not restrict use to Forest Service system trails. The Travel Management Plan (Alternatives 2 through 7-M) will restrict wheeled motorized vehicle travel to "designated" routes, which in most cases are system trails. The intent, under Objective D-2 (Alternative 7-M), is to close and stabilize all trails not otherwise designated for motorized or non-motorized use.
Conrad Anker		637		I am in favor of limiting the discharge of firearms to hunting season only. The dangers, noise, litter and vandalism is not in keeping with a recreation corridor near a population center.	General	Restrictions on firearm use is not within the scope of the Travel Management Plan analysis and decision and therefore it was not considered within the range of alternatives. The focus of the Travel Management Plan is on the types of use and season of use allowed on the Gallatin National Forest transportation system.
Stephen Hunts		559	Bozeman	I urge the Forest Service to close and rehabilitate ALL user created trails. These trails cannot be allowed to continue to be used.	General	The Travel Management Plan (Alternatives 2 through 7-M) will restrict wheeled motorized vehicle travel to "designated" routes, which in most cases are system trails. The intent, under Objective D-2 is to close and stabilize all trails not otherwise designated for motorized or non-motorized use.
Scott Traucht		692		Why did you not include river travel? Many of the higher accesses are Forest Service. Use is so high that its not fun on the river anymore.	General	Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks is the appropriate lead management agency to address travel (i.e. boating) issues on lakes and rivers.
Paul Griffin	Gallatin Wildlife Association	707	Bozeman	Vehicle Identification - Vehicle Identification needs improvement. The USFS should work with the Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks and Montana legislators to require easily visible registration numbers on ATVs.	General	This is a good suggestion and is one tool that could be considered to help in gaining compliance with the use restrictions identified in this Travel Management Plan.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency	587		It is not clear, however, if elements of the travel plan will supercede the OHV EIS decision. We suggest that this be clarified in the FEIS.	General	The Travel Management Plan meets direction in the Montana-Dakota OHV decision (USDA, January 2005) to go through a process of designating the routes where wheeled motorized vehicle use is allowed. The Travel

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Region 8, Montana Office					Management Plan also goes further by addressing all types of travel and not just OHVs.
John w. Criger		1789	Colorado	It does not make any sense to eliminate motorized use, which will in turn end the harvesting of timber from the forest using mechanized equipment. Once an area is closed to vehicle travel the agency will never be able to get approval to reopen it to vehicle use be it for public or for future forest management needs. If the travel plan is approved as currently written, timber harvest will be significantly decreased and future un-controlled forest fires will happen just as they did in Yellowstone and have occurred on other national forests.	General	The Travel Management Plan focuses on public recreation travel. While administrative uses are addressed to some degree, care was taken to avoid decisions that could adversely affect access for other resource management activities. Refer to the section on "extractive uses" in Chapter 4 of the FEIS for more information.
Charles R. Pipal		1832	Manhattan	More and more of our public land is unknowingly being taken away from the general public by a minority population of individuals trying to lock everyone else out of the forest in order to create their private wilderness. Please use some common sense in making your next decision regarding closing up the wonderful gem of a forest you have to manage.	General	It would not be appropriate for us to respond to this commenters claim about the motives of certain individuals. We tried very hard to listen to all points of view during the three comment periods and were most interested to hear from those who actually used the Gallatin National Forest. Comments from all types of users were considered and they did influence the final Plan. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's rationale for the Travel Management Plan alternative she chose
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness Society	1882		An ethic should purport a common goal, NOT perpetuate questions of public access or of one form of recreation being held in higher regard than another. Moreover, our task is to manage a finite, and fragile resource, NOT fight against one another over our recreational preference. It is a question of prioritizing the many choices we face in managing the forest now and into the future. In this respect, outlining the issues is important in understanding the sometimes competing, sometimes complementary forces at work. Establishing a means to value each of these respective issues appropriately is the real task at hand for public land managers and those seeking to influence the final decision. Without making some difficult choices now, we face a lose-lose scenario. Without rising above the issue of user conflict, the GNF and its resources will lose.	General	As discussed in Chapter 1 of the FEIS, we believed it was time to develop a comprehensive travel management plan for the Gallatin National Forest for basically the reasons this commenter outlines. In summary, increasing demand, new information on the potential effects to resources and diverse personal value sets have brought more attention and concern as to how the public uses the Forest. The demand for recreation opportunities has reached the point of exceeding the capability of the land to provide them. In other words, the various uses must be managed to preserve desired recreational experiences and protect other resource values.
David Scrimm	Montana Wilderness	1910		The 300-foot corridor either side of the motorized route has no scientific or statistical basis. The Forest	General	The 300 foot allowance was carried forward into the Gallatin Forest Travel Plan from the decision of the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Association			presents no information in the DEIS to explain why 300-feet on either side of a route are required or even necessary for recreationists to access a suitable number of dispersed campsites or picnic areas. The 300-foot standard (A-6) will be a nightmare to enforce. How is the 300-foot standard in compliance with CFR 261.13. Finally, how is the implementation of the 300-foot standard in compliance with Executive Orders 11644 and 11989?		Northern Regional Forester in the Off-Highway Vehicle Record of Decision and Plan Amendment for Montana, North Dakota, and Portions of South Dakota (USDA, Jan. 2001, page 4). The intent of this allowance is not to give motorized users a license to meander back and forth within 300 feet of a road or trail. It is specifically to allow access to dispersed campsites away from the designated route. Therefore, in Alternative 7-M the standard (Standard A-8) was modified to read as follows: "Wheeled motorized vehicle travel will be allowed to access a campsite within 300'of a designated road or trail unless specifically restricted or unless such use would result in damage or unreasonable disturbance to land, wildlife or vegetative resources."
Thomas B. Wells		553		Goal 1 - This goal should be restated. All motorized use should be eliminated from the core Crest area. The early season damage (on July 4) is substantial.	Goals and Objectives	Under the preferred alternative (Alternative 7-M), the Gallatin Crest Trail would be open to motorcycles from July 15th to September 15th, annually. The rationale for this decision is described in the Record of Decision under the discussion of the Hyalite/Porcupine-Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area and also the Gallatin Crest Travel Planning Area. In short, this trail is popular with motorcyclists, has been used historically, and is one of the few places where a high elevation riding opportunity can be provided.
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		A major failing that needs to be addressed in whichever alternative chosen, is the lack of road density standards monitoring. As a monitoring tool, road density is critical to understanding habitat quality. As a management tool, limiting road density - especially in core areas greater than 5,000 acres is crucial for maintaining healthy grizzly bear populations. While it is clear that this Travel Plan is an attempt to increase the forest's management of motorized travel, it is still no excuse to drop road density standards from the forest. We strongly urge GNF, in this travel plan, to adopt road density standards on the model of Targhee National Forest. It is vital to continue to monitor road densities on the BMU subunit level, so that cumulative effects of new and existing roads and motorized trails do not compromise grizzly bear habitat security. Barring implementation of specific mi/sq mi standards, we believe it is necessary to at least maintain the habitat	Grizzly Bears	Alternatives 2 through 7-M replaces the road density standard of the current Forest Plan with specific decisions concerning motorized use. Open road density, motorized route density, and the habitat effectiveness rating is a result of the Travel Plan decision. The preferred alternative also includes a standard (see Standard D-6 for Alternative 7-M) that precludes establishment of new permanent motorized routes not designated for such use in the Travel Management Plan. In other words, the direction of the Travel Management Plan is to maintain, over time, the motorized route density established by the decisions for use of each road and trail. For more information, refer to the discussion of amendments and grizzly bears in the Record of Decision, and Chapter 1, Chapter 3 (pages 3-214 to 3-224 and 3-254 to 3-329) and Appendix A of the FEIS.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				security measurements (percent secure) that have been in place on the Gallatin.		
Richard Griffen		1080		A new trail in Hyalite Creek would be a great way to avoid the road traffic - it should cater to the free ride mountain bike crowd with berms, jumps, etc.	Hyalite	Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of publication of the FEIS, does not include the parallel trail opposite of the Hyalite Road. While we believed it would be beneficial to separate bicycle travel from passenger cars, maintaining high traffic routes on both sides of the creek were shown in analysis to have unacceptable effects on the riparian zone and wildlife. Alternative 7-M does however include an objective for the Hyalite Travel Planning Area to widen the existing road to provide for safer, more desirable mountain biking.
David A. and Carolyn L. Swingle		1136		Fishing shanties should be banned from Hyalite Reservoir (many are abandoned and sink during ice breakup and imperil boats).	Hyalite	Frozen lakes are considered waters of the State, so Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks (FWP), not the Forest Service, would be the appropriate agency to address this issue.
Amber Jean Reinhard		1499	Livingston	I would not support the banning of mountain biking in the Hyalite area. I have seen more impact on those trails particularly from horses than from mountain bikes. I have never experienced poor etiquette from mountain bikers in that area.	Hyalite	Under the preferred alternative (Alternative 7-M), most trails within the Hyalite Travel Planning Area, as well as the Hyalite and East Fork of Hyalite Trails would be open to mountain biking. Mountain biking would be prohibited on the East Fork Divide Trail #171, the Grotto Falls Trail #432 and the Palisade Falls Trail #433. The primary reason mountain biking is prohibited on these routes is that they are popular short hiking trails and the latter two are also designed to provide opportunities for disabled individuals.
Amber Jean Reinhard		1499		Hyalite trails are part of a complex trail system where we have biked loops from Big Creek to Hyalite, Squaw Creek to Hyalite, etc. so shutting the Hyalite trails would impact the mnt. Biking community extremely.	Hyalite	Under the preferred alternative (Alternative 7-M), most trails within the Hyalite Travel Planning Area, as well as the Hyalite and East Fork of Hyalite Trails would be open to mountain biking. Mountain biking would be prohibited on the East Fork Divide Trail #171, the Grotto Falls Trail #432 s and the Palisade Falls Trail #433. The primary reason mountain biking is prohibited on these routes is that they are popular short hiking trails and the latter two are also designed to provide opportunities for disabled individuals.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		In summer, the goal of emphasizing family-oriented hiking, biking, and pleasure driving is suitable and very welcome. However, many of the specific recommendations are inconsistent with this goal, as motorized use is the predominant use of most trails and abandoned roads, including the Moser, Hood/Lick, Wildhorse, and Langhor roads, trails, and	Hyalite	The summer recreation goal (Goal 1) for the Hyalite Travel Planning Area, under most alternatives including the preferred alternative, is to provide for both motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities. There is an emphasis on family oriented hiking, biking, and pleasure driving because the quality of those opportunities in this area are considered superior to the ATV/motorcycle

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				areas.		opportunities.
	Natural Recourses Conservation Service	248	Bozeman	If the agency's preferred alternative is chosen, the NRCS requests the Gallatin National Forest grant NRCS summer and winter administrative motorized access to the following snow survey sites affected by the proposed travel plan changes: Bozeman Ranger District: Shower Falls and Lick Creek SNOTEL sites and Arch Falls snow course, all in the Hyalite drainage.	Hyalite	Regardless of the selected alternative for a travel management plan, administrative access to snow survey sites would be addressed through the permit issued to the NRCS. Standard A-6, under Alternatives 2 through 7-M, specifically allows for wheeled motorized cross-country travel for lessees and permittees if authorized by a federal lease or permit. If issues are identified over motorized access to snow survey or SNOTEL sites, they would be handled through the permit renewal process.
Marty Malone		103		One of the environmental consequences that you quote in the EIS is invasive species. You are using invasive species as a tool to shut down motorized vehicles on the Forest. There is no definitive evidence that invasive species are spread by motorized vehicles and more than they are speed by bicycles, horses, or people.	Issues	Pages 3-350 through 3-358 of the FEIS discusses the predicted effects of the Travel Plan alternatives on the spread of invasive weeds. Conclusions of the Forest Supervisor on how this issue influenced her decision are disclosed in the Record of Decision. NEPA requires analysis and disclosure of the environmental consequences of proposed federal actions (40 CFR 1502.16). The potential effects of the proposed Travel Management Plan on invasive weed spread was identified as an issue needing analysis to comply with NEPA.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The Forest contains hundreds of miles of roads that should be obliterated and restored. While we recognize the magnitude of this job, we feel strongly that the agency must include a plan, with a timeline and a list of priority areas for restoration in the travel plan. We encourage you to consider the following as priority locations for restoration: North Bridgers East and Fairy Lake, Taylor Fork which includes portions of a BMU, and Hebgen Basin which is also in a BMU.	Issues	Alternative 7-M, the Forest Service preferred alternative at the time of this FEIS preparation, includes a forest-wide objective (Obj. D-1) to close and rehabilitate existing roads that are in excess to administrative, recreation and access needs. This objective is also included in Alternatives 2-6 as Objective C-1 We did not include a schedule or listing of priorities within the Travel Plan because developing such a schedule is not a decision point in which NEPA would apply. Establishing and committing to a timeline is also not advisable because there are too many variables (such as annual budgets) that can influence the timing and order in which work gets done. In general however, priorities for road decommissioning would be based on where the facilities are having the greatest adverse impacts. Preventing sedimentation of streams containing westslope and Yellowstone cutthroat trout and improving secure habitat for threatened and endangered species would certainly be toward the top of the list.
Betsy Buffington and Janice	The Wilderness	1617		Enact a forest-wide TMRD of one mile per square mile. The Kootenai forest has identified a risk index	Issues	Alternatives 2 through 7-M replaces the road density standard of the current Forest Plan with specific

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Thomson	Society			that identifies all areas containing less than 1 mile/per square mile as low risk for lynx. Given the lynx's vulnerability to both road kill and illegal harvest this standard should be applied to all lynx habitat on the Gallatin. Because a significant amount of lynx habitat on the Gallatin occurs in already roaded areas this is an additional reason for proceeding with the restoration of these areas.		decisions concerning motorized use. The preferred alternative also includes a standard (see Standard D-6 for Alternative 7-M) that precludes establishment of new permanent motorized routes not designated for such use in the Travel Management Plan. In other words, the direction of the Travel Management Plan is to maintain, over time, the motorized route density established by the decisions for use of each road and trail. Given that, it would not make sense to retain or add a motorized route density standard. For more information, refer to the discussion of amendments and lynx in the Record of Decision, and Chapter 1, Chapter 3 (pages 3-214 to 3-224 and pages 3-359 to 3-395) and Appendix A of the FEIS. For a discussion of the predicted impacts of the alternatives to lynx and lynx habitat refer to the FEIS, pages 3-359 to 3-395.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Travel Planning is the right time to address the issue of obliteration these roads and restoration of habitat. Travel planning should not only be about recreation allocation, but also about resource issues including how roads and trails will be managed, including obliteration, in the future.	Issues	Alternative 7-M, the Forest Service preferred alternative at the time of this FEIS preparation, includes a forest-wide objective (Obj. D-1) to close and rehabilitate existing roads that are in excess to administrative, recreation and access needs. This objective is also included in Alternatives 2-6 as Objective C-1.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Close all routes lacking designated use or providing redundant access.	Issues	Alternative 7-M, the Forest Service preferred alternative at the time of this FEIS preparation, includes forest-wide objectives (Objectives D-1 and D-2) to close and rehabilitate existing roads and trails that are in excess to administrative, recreation and access needs. This objective is also included in Alternatives 2-6 as Objectives C-1 and C-2.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Establish a process for closure and reclamation for all roads and motorized trails closed under the new transportation plan. This should include the creation and adoption of obliteration and reclamation standards that will restore the area.	Issues	Alternative 7-M, the Forest Service preferred alternative at the time of this FEIS preparation, includes forest-wide objectives (Objectives D-1 and D-2) to close and rehabilitate existing roads and trails that are in excess to administrative, recreation and access needs. These objectives are also included in Alternatives 2-6 as Objectives C-1 and C-2. Detailed reclamation standards are not included as they would vary depending on the site-specific situation.
Mark Lamm		539	Bozeman	There has been an increase in vehicular traffic of all kinds (motorized and non-motorized) that has created visible degradation of forest resource habitat in the form of: a) increased road dust…., b) Increased petrochemical based contamination…., c)	Issues	We agree that there has been and will likely continue to be increases in all types of use of the Gallatin National Forest. As discussed in Chapter 1 of the FEIS (page 1-2, and 1-10 through 1-14) this is one of the reasons that the Forest Service felt that a travel management plan

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Increased litter and visible signs of misuse in all resource areas accessed. d) Increased degradation of road and trail buffer areas surrounding roads and trails where heavy motorized and non-motorized use occurs. e) Increased siltation and pollution of fragile watershed drainage areas.... f) A visible decrease in observable wildlife of all species. g) Excessive erosion.... h) Increased noise pollution from human presence often in fragile habitat environments including observed unsafe gunfire where other are present. j) Increase in the evidence of haphazard and excessive herbicide use .... I notice a steady increase in the presence of noxious weeds despite this spraying.		was needed. We believed that the demand for recreation opportunities is now reaching a point of exceeding the capability of the land to provide for them without use restrictions. For information about the environmental consequences of the Travel Management Plan, and alternatives, refer to Chapter 3 of the FEIS and Section V(D) of the Record of Decision.
Becky Johnson		1353		Administrative roads and project roads are essentially not included in any analysis. These roads, many of which exist on lands obtained in the recent past and intended to be managed primarily for wildlife, account for many miles of road on the forest, and as such should be included in any detailed analysis of the vehicular use.	Issues	Administrative and project roads are included in the analysis of issues as appropriate. For example, administrative roads are included in calculations of open motorized route density. Project roads are not included in these calculations because they are not managed for public motorized use and are targeted for effective closure in Alternatives 2 through 6 (i.e. they are not open motorized routes). The sections addressing each issue in Chapter 3 of the FEIS includes a discussion of analysis methodology.
David Keltner	Bear Creek Council	1366		The Travel Plan addresses project and administrative roads only tangentially. The travel plan needs to address forest uses outlined in the forest plan, instead the next forest plan is going to have all these roads and planners will most likely come up with the purpose to keep these roads. Most if not all the project and administrative roads on the Gardiner Ranger District should be closed. The land these roads reside upon was purchased to secure wildlife habitat. Continued use of (these) roads (is not consistent with) the purpose of the exchanges and purchases.	Issues	Alternative 7-M, the Forest Service preferred alternative at the time of this FEIS preparation, includes forest-wide objectives (Objectives D-1 and D-2) to close and rehabilitate existing roads and trails that are in excess to administrative, recreation and access needs. These objectives are also included in Alternatives 2-6 as Objectives C-1 and C-2. Project roads are considered excess. They were shown on the maps because they are existing routes and in some cases, could provide opportunities for motorized recreation that should be considered. Administrative roads are not excess but are needed to serve some purpose outside of public motorized travel. For example, some provide access to sites and facilities (e.g. utility lines, communication sites, Forest Service stations) and others may access private land or dwellings. In other words these roads are gated rather than barricaded because their is some identified need for their periodic use.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	1441		Access to public lands is important (but) it should not adversely affect wildlife and wildlife habitat or diminish "fair chase" hunting. The "Description of Access Needs" section is not necessarily complete or accurate and needs to be corrected.	Issues	Table I-8 in Chapter I of the Detailed Description of Alternatives displays locations where the Forest Service desires access. There has been some updates and corrections to this table since the Draft EIS, but since the comment is not specific to given locations we cannot respond in more detail. However, it is important to understand that objectives to acquire access do not necessarily mean that the intent is to build a road there. The basic principle is that the Forest Service believes that the public has a right to reasonable access to National Forest System lands and that it should not be controlled for the exclusive use of an adjacent private landowner.
Joe Polus		1487	Bozeman	We would like to propose for the FEIS Issue 24: management solutions, and how those solutions will benefit the complex mixture of Forest, Habitat, Wildlife, and People and Recreation.	Issues	This comment may not have been captured correctly during content analysis or the specific solutions proposed may be included as separate comments. Irregardless, Issue 24 is "air quality" and this was determined to be a non-significant issue in the travel plan analysis or decision. In other words, none of the alternatives considered resulted in unacceptable air quality effects. This issue however pertains to general air quality and not the odor generated by combustion engines that may diminish another users experience of Forest trails. The latter issue is addressed as part of the recreation effects discussion in Chapter 3 of the FEIS.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		The travel plan amendment infers that future evaluations of roading impacts on wildlife will be left to the discretion of individual biologists. This will make it difficult for the public to understand how site-specific evaluations are going to be done, as the "analysis methods" will be determined at the time the site-specific project is done, and these may be different for each project.	Issues	Irrespective of the standards that would be removed through the travel plan decision, environmental impacts for future proposals would be assessed using current methodology and scientific literature. Analysis methodology changes over time as information improves and new studies become available. For this reason, we don’t believe it is appropriate to include procedural (i.e. analysis methodology) direction as Forest Plan standards.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		The lack of specific evaluation criteria (thresholds) for wildlife in the Travel Plan amendment will allow significant increases in many portions of the Forest for recreation/motorized disturbances for species as elk, grizzly bear and lynx.	Issues	Alternatives 2 through 7-M replaces the road density standard of the current Forest Plan with specific decisions concerning motorized use. The preferred alternative also includes a standard (see Standard D-6 for Alternative 7-M) that precludes establishment of new permanent motorized routes not designated for such use in the Travel Management Plan. In other words, the direction of the Travel Management Plan is to maintain, over time, the motorized route density established by the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						decisions for use of each road and trail (i.e. no proliferation of motorized use). Given that, it would not make sense to retain or add a motorized route density standard. For more information, refer to the discussion of amendments in the Record of Decision, and Chapter 1, Chapter 3 (pages 3-214 to 3-224) and Appendix A of the FEIS.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		The specific mitigation proposed for each travel planning unit for various species of wildlife was hard to locate in the documents. In a number of discussions, including that on the lynx, the reader is referred to the "mitigation section." We could not understand where this is. Could you clarify specific mitigation for wildlife in the final EIS/Amendment?	Issues	References to a "mitigation section" in the Draft EIS may have been an error caused by bringing information from individual specialist reports into the EIS itself. There is no separate section in the EIS for mitigation. Mitigation in the Travel Plan was included: (1) As seasonal restrictions on use which can be found in the route tables within Chapter II of the Detailed Description of Alternatives. (2) As "standards and guidelines" which can be found in Chapter I of the Detailed Description of the Alternatives and for each travel planning area discussed in Chapter II of this same document.
Brian Hawthorn	Blue Ribbon Coalition	1196		Impacts should be evaluated and disclosed in a fair and unbiased manner and with a relative sense of magnitude. Analysis of vehicle use should be compared and contrasted to baseline data in order to establish a threshold on which the significance of the impacts of the proposed actions can be determined. The absence of a rational connection between the facts found and the choice made has been defined by the courts as arbitrary and capricious.	Issues	The evaluation of environmental consequences for significant issues can be found in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. There is also a section in the Record of Decision that discusses the conclusions reached by the Forest Supervisor about these issues and how they did or did not influence her decision. We believe that the EIS provides a fair and balanced discussion of the impacts and that the rationale for the decision is well-supported by the disclosure of impacts within the EIS.
Brian Hawthorn	Blue Ribbon Coalition	1196		The DEIS failed to evaluate the total population condition of all wildlife. Impacts to wildlife must be evaluated and disclosed in a fair and unbiased manner and with a relative sense of magnitude. Analysis of vehicle use was not compared and contrasted to baseline data in order to establish a threshold on which the significance of the impacts of the proposed actions can be determined.	Issues	There has been modifications in the environmental consequences section (Chapter 3) of the FEIS to improve the understanding of effects. In addition, the discussion of each issue includes a section outlining analysis methodology. The overall population of wildlife species may or may not be useful in understanding the effects or differences between travel plan alternatives. NEPA requires that the significance of an action be analyzed in the appropriate context (40 CFR 1508.7). Significance varies with the setting of the proposed action. For travel planning it is more appropriate to analyze effects at the local level rather than in terms of the nation or region as a whole. It also can be sufficient to use effects to habitat as a proxy for understanding the effects on particular species. In terms of a basis of comparison we might suggest that the commenter first

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						read Section V(D) of the Record of Decision where the Forest Supervisor discloses her conclusions about each of the significant issues. Also, in reading the FEIS, it should be noted that Alternative 1 generally reflects the potential impacts over time of not adopting a travel management plan (i.e. no action), and Alternative 2 generally reflects current conditions.
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness Society	1882		An evaluation of the cumulative effects of OHV use on habitat fragmentation, degradation and loss of habitat security is of vital importance, and therefore, forest wide protection standards, such as the one mile of road per square mile of forest, are needed to ensure the viability of ecosystem processes and components for the GNF and GYE systems at large.	Issues	Alternatives 2 through 7-M replaces the road density standard of the current Forest Plan with specific decisions concerning motorized use. The preferred alternative also includes a standard (see Standard D-6 for Alternative 7-M) that precludes establishment of new permanent motorized routes not designated for such use in the Travel Management Plan. In other words, the direction of the Travel Management Plan is to maintain, over time, the motorized route density established by the decisions for use of each road and trail (i.e. no proliferation of motorized use). Given that, it would not make sense to retain or add a motorized route density standard. For more information, refer to the discussion of amendments in the Record of Decision, and Chapter 1, Chapter 3 (pages 3-214 to 3-224) and Appendix A of the FEIS. Also refer to the cumulative effects sections for each wildlife discussion included in Chapter 3 of the FEIS.
Tammy Sturgis		114		Wildlife numbers have steadily increased every year with the designated travel use in the GNF that is currently in place. To close an additional 356,000 acres to snowmobiling, 40% of the bicycle trails, 70% of the motorized trails and 34,000 acres to pack animals are not warranted or justified. To force more people to recreate in a smaller area will surely adversely affect the resources of that area.	Issues	To respond to this comment we first encourage interested parties to review the maps and route tables associated with the Travel Plan decision rather than focusing on forest-wide summaries of restrictions. The summaries don't give a true picture of the opportunities provided and some of the numbers being espoused are not accurate (e.g. 40% of Forest trails are closed to mountain bikes and 70% of the trails are closed to motorized use). The forest-wide summaries don't account for areas and routes where certain uses do not occur anyway due to physical barriers such as topography, grade, tree cover, and snow conditions. This is not to say that Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of preparation of this FEIS, does not result in further restrictions than exist today. It does, but the scope and magnitude of these restrictions are not as severe as is being portrayed. It is also a misconception that use restrictions are attributable to wildlife. There

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						were 23 significant issues identified and addressed in the FEIS, 18 of which had some influence on the decision. Of all the issues considered, "recreation" was the most influential factor.
R W Black		885		No consideration seems to have been given to the State OHV EIS after much time and effort was spent in developing it.	Laws and Regulations	The Off-Highway Vehicle Record of Decision and Plan Amendment for Montana, North Dakota and portions of South Dakota (USDA, January 2005, page 4) directs the forests and grasslands to go through a site-specific planning process that results in the designation of roads and trails for their appropriate uses. The Gallatin National Forest Travel Plan was proposed, in part, to comply with this direction.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		We ask that all of the instructions and requirements under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act be honored and applied to this project.	Laws and Regulations	Each issue discussion in Chapter 3 of the FEIS includes a section that addresses applicable laws, regulations, policy, and other higher level direction that applies to the Travel Plan. In addition, the process followed was consistent with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the National Forest Management Act (NFMA). Without more specifics in the comment, we're not sure what provisions of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 is of concern.
Catherine Weeden		1604		The exact area of the Lionhead Rec. Wild. Is a mystery to me. I was told by Hebgen District personnel that the areas marked "4" on the 1987 Forest Plan map constituted the LRW. In response to a specific request to clear up the confusion, the GNF put a map on the web that showed the "correct" LRW. Recently, I was told that GNF personnel advised that the map on the web is actually incorrect. It is important that the public can find out what the boundaries of the actual Recommended Wilderness are. At this point it's hard to know what to believe about the LRW boundary.	Lionhead	The recommended wilderness in the Lionhead area was a decision of the Gallatin National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan, 1987) and therefore the Forest Plan map shows the most accurate boundary as a Management Area 4 (MA 4). We apologize for the errors with the map posted on the Gallatin National Forest website.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		The fact that the area is recommended for wilderness is a key piece of knowledge for anyone wanting to evaluate the proposal, and therefore we cannot understand why the agency chose to print the plan maps without showing the boundary. We strongly urge the Forest Service to include the LRW boundary on future editions of all Forest maps that cover this area.	Lionhead	In response to complaints about the maps we provided with the Starting Benchmark we modified them to make them clearer and to give people more reference points for locating specific routes and areas. We had to produce three maps for each alternative because attempting to display all combinations of use on one map resulted in far too much clutter. We also made a judgment call on what else to include on the maps such as topographical features, section lines, travel planning area boundaries, private land, etc. We chose not to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						include the management area (MA) 4 line from the Forest Plan that delineates the Lionhead recommended wilderness, but instead post it on a separate map available on our website. We apologize that this map was in error, but felt that we had adequately cleared up any confusion it may have caused.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We agree with the reasoning as expressed in the DEIS: The LrWs highest and best use is as Wilderness, and all recommended Wilderness should be managed as motor free. We also strongly recommend that the Forest Service close the LRW to mountain bikes. There are as yet few people who mountain bike in the LRW, so designating it as bike free will have little user impact and will protect the area from future degradation of its wilderness character. Despite the rational as quoted above, the Forest Service is proposing to designate a snowmobile area in the eastern part of the LRW. There are several problems with this proposal for an open snowmobile area. First, it is unambiguously at odds with the Forest Service's own, clearly stated logic and rationale. Second, rethinking the manageability of the LRW boundary as defined in the existing Forest Plan is not a travel plan decision; it is a Forest Plan decision, and should rightfully be a topic only of a specific plan revision, for example in the upcoming Forest Plan. Third, in our ground-trotting of the area, we have found that the twisting and intersecting ridgelines above Watkins Creek do not provide a clear boundary at all. It is obvious on the ground why the boundary has been set along Watkins Creek; the creek is very well defined with an entrenched streambed, and would be obvious even with many feet of snow on it.	Lionhead	Management of travel within the Lionhead recommended wilderness was a subject of considerable debate and thought. Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of the time this EIS was prepared would allow snowmobiling in a portion of this area and also allow mountain bike use on included trails. The rationale for allowing snowmobiling into part of the area was that we believed the area was inviting to snowmobilers and that establishing a restriction at the boundary of the recommended wilderness would not be manageable. For mountain biking it was an oversight. Our focus was on whether motorized use should be allowed or managed for and frankly didn't think about biking also being of issue. The primary reason that travel management of this area required so much thought and debate was that Congress never acted on the recommendation and the Gallatin Forest Plan does not specifically preclude mechanized uses. There is also no legal or policy requirement that prohibits such use as long as the wilderness character is maintained. However, management of travel in the Lionhead recommended wilderness has not been decided as of the time this response to comment was written. There are valid reasons to preclude mechanized uses as the commenter suggests. Please refer to the Record of Decision for the final determination of how travel in this area is to be managed and the rationale for it.
R W Black		885		The maps used for this travel plan seem to have little relationship to the actual trails.	Maps	We believe that the alternative maps provide adequate depictions of the road and trail system for the purpose of analyzing potential impacts, facilitating public comments, and ultimately making decisions about the appropriate uses for each of these routes. The basis for the route locations is the 1999 Gallatin National Forest Recreation Visitor Map.
James Brown		894	Livingston	The actual routes on the ground should be included on the maps.	Maps	We believe that the alternative maps provide adequate depictions of the road and trail system for the purpose of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						analyzing potential impacts, facilitating public comments, and ultimately making decisions about the appropriate uses for each of these routes. The basis for the route locations is the 1999 Gallatin National Forest Recreation Visitor Map. Attempting to conduct an inventory of all non-system routes (e.g. user-built routes and game trails) was not considered practical or necessary. Alternative 1 would allow for off-route motorized travel and therefore it would be legal under that option to ride ATV's and motorcycles on non-system routes outside of Wilderness or other previously restricted areas. In addition, the initial Benchmark Travel Plan alternative displayed system trails and other routes that we knew of. During the comment period provided at that time we asked users to identify any other routes, not displayed, that they believed should be considered in the planning process.
Ramona Ehnes	Great Falls Bike Riders Assn	918	Great Falls	It is common knowledge that the baseline maps for this process did not include the existing legal routes on the ground and that the GPS information that was available, gathered by USFS employees was not considered. We request the actual existing legal routes on the ground be given consideration in the FEIS.	Maps	We believe that the alternative maps provide adequate depictions of the road and trail system for the purpose of analyzing potential impacts, facilitating public comments, and ultimately making decisions about the appropriate uses for each of these routes. The basis for the route locations is the 1999 Gallatin National Forest Recreation Visitor Map. Attempting to conduct an inventory of all non-system routes (e.g. user-built routes and game trails) was not considered practical or necessary. Alternative 1 would allow for off-route motorized travel and therefore it would be legal under that option to ride ATV's and motorcycles on non-system routes outside of Wilderness or other previously restricted areas. In addition, the initial Benchmark Travel Plan alternative displayed system trails and other routes that we knew of. During the comment period provided at that time we asked users to identify any other routes, not displayed, that they believed should be considered in the planning process.
Noreen Breeding		1004	Bozeman	The boundaries of the Lionhead recommended wilderness area should be shown on the GNF maps as well as the Travel Plan maps	Maps	In response to complaints about the maps we provided with the Starting Benchmark we modified them to make them clearer and to give people more reference points for locating specific routes and areas. We had to produce three maps for each alternative because attempting to display all combinations of use on one map resulted in far too much clutter. We also made a

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						judgment call on what else to include on the maps such as topographical features, section lines, travel planning area boundaries, private land, etc. We chose not to include the management area (MA) 4 line from the Forest Plan that delineates the Lionhead recommended wilderness, but instead post it on a separate map available on our website. We apologize that this map was in error, but felt that we had adequately cleared up any confusion it may have caused.
James H. Brown		1209	Livingston	The actual routes on the ground should be included on the maps. There was a route inventory information collected by the USFS that was not considered or included in the planning process. The study done with photos and GPS coordinates was not incorporated into the DEIS.	Maps	Ongoing monitoring work that has been conducted by Forest Service employee Todd Orr was used for analysis purposes in the EIS. Non-system routes he identified were not used on the maps because the national protocol for travel planning is to begin with Forest Service "system" roads and trails. Other routes can be considered as additions to this baseline.
Ken Salo	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1916		It does not appear that all routes meeting the definition of routes under the 3-States OHV agreement have been shown on the travel maps. We request that the Forest Plan maps be checked against all existing travel plan and forest visitor's maps, and USGS quad sheets including historic forest and USGS maps. We request that the FS honor the 3-state OHV agreement and provide a comprehensive inventory and verification program to assure that the maps reflect all of the existing routes that currently meet 3-States OHV definitions.	Maps	Attempting to conduct an inventory of all non-system routes was not considered practical or necessary. Alternative 1 would allow for off-route motorized travel and therefore it would be legal under that option to ride ATV's and motorcycles on non-system routes outside of Wilderness or other previously restricted areas. In addition, the initial Benchmark Travel Plan alternative displayed system trails and other routes that we knew of. During the comment period provided at that time we asked users to identify any other routes, not displayed, that they believed should be considered in the planning process. This is consistent with national protocol for travel planning (i.e. to begin with Forest Service "system" roads and trails). Other routes can be considered as additions to this baseline.
Timothy L. Ravndal	Montana Multiple Use Association, Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1032	Helena	The alternatives in the proposal cover the NEPA requirements for allowing the public to analyze the management directives that the FS is bringing forward. However, none of the alternatives provide for mitigation measures that are specific to the issues cited.	Mitigation	Mitigation in the Travel Plan was included: (1) As seasonal restrictions on use which can be found in the route tables within Chapter II of the Detailed Description of Alternatives. (2) As "standards and guidelines" which can be found in Chapter I of the Detailed Description of the Alternatives and for each travel planning area discussed in Chapter II of this same document. Explanations of the reasons for the various seasonal restrictions can be found at the beginning of Chapter II of the Detailed Description of the Alternatives. The purpose of standards and guidelines should be evident within the text of this direction.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness Society	1882		If past monitoring has been ineffective, then the agency must acknowledge and account for uncertainty in its final decision and the agency should address what information it is using to consider and incorporate past effects of OHV use on wildlife, water quality, and non-motorized users. Uncertainty as to the effects, both past and future, of OHV use cannot, under NEPA, preclude consideration of the most protective alternative - limiting motorized travel to existing roads and designated motorized trails that have been proven, by NEPA analysis, to have no adverse effect on GNF resources.	Monitoring	For each issue discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS, there is a section which addresses analysis methodology. The Record of Decision includes a discussion of the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about these issues and to what degree they influenced her final decision.
Jay Fisher		913	Billings	The Preferred Alternative is violating the Washington Office of the Forest Service. It states that OHV recreating is a legitimate use of the forest. This applies to all of the forest, not just a few areas. Restricted use is only going to keep more traffic on fewer areas, bring more complaints by the environmentalists that will only cause more problems.	Motorized (General)	We're not sure what specific Forest Service Washington Office direction the commenter is referring to but we agree that providing opportunities for OHV riding is a legitimate use of the National Forest. This does not mean however, that OHV use cannot be managed, controlled, and/or restricted from some parts of the Forest to provide non-motorized recreation settings and/or protect other resource values.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Statements shall be concise, clear, and to the point, and shall be supported by evidence that the agency has made the necessary environmental analysis. These requirements have not met and I request that these deficiencies be addressed by developing a starting benchmark that identifies all existing roads and trails including non-system routes and those falling under some undefined definitions of "unusable" as well as any and all roads and trails presently closed to motorized users for whatever reason as long as they are outside wilderness.	Motorized (general)	Attempting to conduct an inventory of all non-system routes was not considered practical or necessary. Alternative 1 would allow for off-route motorized travel and therefore it would be legal under that option to ride ATV's and motorcycles on non-system routes outside of Wilderness or other previously restricted areas. In addition, the initial Benchmark Travel Plan alternative displayed system trails and other routes that we knew of. During the comment period provided at that time we asked users to identify any other routes, not displayed, that they believed should be considered in the planning process. This is consistent with national protocol for travel planning (i.e. to begin with Forest Service "system" roads and trails). Other routes can be considered as additions to this baseline.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	I request that all trails and roads be considered the "starting benchmark" in order to avoid contributing further to significant cumulative impacts that prevailing trends of years past have had on motorized access and motorized recreation.	Motorized (general)	Attempting to conduct an inventory of all non-system routes was not considered practical or necessary. Alternative 1 would allow for off-route motorized travel and therefore it would be legal under that option to ride ATV's and motorcycles on non-system routes outside of Wilderness or other previously restricted areas. In addition, the initial Benchmark Travel Plan alternative

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						displayed system trails and other routes that we knew of. During the comment period provided at that time we asked users to identify any other routes, not displayed, that they believed should be considered in the planning process. This is consistent with national protocol for travel planning (i.e. to begin with Forest Service "system" roads and trails). Other routes can be considered as additions to this baseline.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Quoted p 9 Benchmark " There will be uninventoried and other roads and trails on the forest where travel is not designated through the travel plan. This is especially true on lands recently acquired through purchase or exchange. Our assumption will be that any road or trail not specifically designated otherwise will be closed to summer, public motorized use." I would suggest that if a road or trail is not inventoried, it should be open. Certainly at least at the start of this process. If it is not closed during this process, then it should be open. Once something is closed, it is nearly impossible to convince you to reopen it.	Motorized (general)	The quotation cited by the commenter is part of a larger discussion regarding, what at that time would have been, the future development of alternatives. It was a disclosure of an assumption we were making and that is if a route is not identified, and thus not designated for motorized use in the Travel Management Plan, it will be closed to wheeled motor vehicle use. Consistent with national protocol we began the travel planning process with Forest Service "system" roads and trails. If in public comment other routes were identified, they could be considered in addition to this baseline. Also, Alternative 1 was developed, in part, to present the option of allowing off-route wheeled motorized travel, which in turn would mean that any user-built trail or road, not already within a restricted area (e.g. Wilderness) would be legal for OHV travel, whether on the inventory of Forest Service system trails or not.
David Konecny		1371	Bozeman	I am rather concerned with this proposal, as in the summary it doesn't even specifically mention 4x4 use as one of the opportunities that the forest has to offer. I would assume that 4x4 use covered under the other uses. I would be very interested in hearing any reasons for basically excluding 4x4 vehicles in your proposal.	Motorized (General)	The Summary of the Draft EIS at page 7 does state that "The proposal would designate up to 420 miles of the Gallatin National Forest road network for 4x4 high-clearance vehicles." In the Comparison of Opportunities section (Table 1.1) it also summarizes the miles of road by alternative where 4x4 travel would be managed for. For more detailed information, one would need to review the summer motorized alternative maps and/or the individual route tables contained in the document "Detailed Description of the Alternatives." The documents provided with the FEIS are structured similarly.
Jeff Lair		1387	Belgrade	Why would some trails be open to motorcycles and not ATVs. They should be open to both.	Motorized (General)	In general, the primary reason some trails would be managed for motorcycles but not ATV's is that motorcycles can navigate single track trails not suitable for ATV use. Conversely, re-constructing trails to accommodate ATV's detract from the challenge ride experiences many motorcyclists are looking for. As

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						discussed in the FEIS there are also other effects that differ between ATV and motorcycle-only trails.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		The current travel situation is at least partially a result of inadequate planning, monitoring, and enforcement in the past. Therefore, we believe that existing motorized uses must be justified before being allowed to continue, and not being allowed to continue just because they exist now.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that motorized use is a legitimate use of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives, and ultimately determine where opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		Our members have ridden over most of the currently open routes in the project area and have thoroughly enjoyed them but we could not accurately draw lines on a map to describe where we have been and what routes we want to remain open. We are puzzled by this requirement. We have never had to identify and inventory backpacking routes that we wish to remain open. We are very concerned about the burden and disadvantage that is placed on motorized recreationists by this procedure and we request that it be changed.	Motorized (General)	The maps depicted the Gallatin National Forest system of roads and trails. We had no requirement that the public draw routes where they have been on a map. That being said, the commenter may be referring to our approach whereby we started with system routes and offered to consider other non-system routes for possible designation as a motorized use opportunity. This approach is consistent with national protocol, and we're not sure how we could include other routes for consideration if not identified by the actual users. There were many comments suggesting that we should begin with an intensive inventory of all roads and trails on the landscape, but this would not be practical or necessary. It didn't seem to us that it would be too much to expect to ask a user to describe an unmapped route that they wanted considered. Even if they couldn't draw it on a map we would hope they could tell us where the route left a road or system trail, or identify topographical features such as peaks, ridges, creeks, or lakes such that it could be investigated.
				I would like to encourage the FS to treat mountain bikers as quiet users. Please do not lump mountain bikers in the same category as motorcyclists or ATVs. Mountain bikers prefer quiet, singletrack trails over the extra wide trails caused by motorcycles and two track trails or even the road-sized trails caused by ATV traffic.	Mountain Bikes	Alternatives 2 through 7-M each would provide mountain biking opportunities on trails that would not be open to motorized use.
Robb Larson		1391		Because of the larger distances that bicyclists travel on a typical outing, there are relatively few encounters with hikers beyond the first few miles of a given trail. This fact points to the logical grouping of	Mountain Bikes	Under Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of the preparation of this EIS, most Forest trails would be open to mountain bikes. Generally mountain bike restrictions would be on trails leading into Wilderness, a number of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				cycling activity with hiking activity on trails in the region covered by this planning document.		trails within the Hyalite/Porcupine-Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area, and a few trails heavily used by hikers or stock (e.g. the "M" Trail).
Michelle Stevens-Orton		1472a	Bozeman	I am dismayed to have mountain biking liked with motorized use over and over again throughout the plan. Peddling up a trail and breathing dust and fumes is very difficult, and to have my access practically limited to those trails that are designated for motorized vehicles does not make any sense.	Mountain Bikes	Under Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of the preparation of this EIS, most Forest trails would be open to mountain bikes. Generally mountain bike restrictions would be on trails leading into Wilderness, a number of trails within the Hyalite/Porcupine-Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area, and a few trails heavily used by hikers or stock (e.g. the "M" Trail). Under this alternative there a number mountain biking opportunities on trails that would not be open to motorized use.
Alex Phillips		1483a		I must say that the FS kind of dropped the ball with the mountain bike community. The first time the GNF acknowledges that mountain bikes exist it is to close the two most popular trails to mountain biking (Emerald-Hyalite). It was never explained. Was it user conflict? Because the trails are in the WSA? Another oddity was the alternative during the last round that closed trails in the WSA to mountain bikes but not motorcycles!! It seemed like the FS was trying to piss off the mountain bikers! I really urge the FS to do more to explain and to work with mountain bikers.	Mountain Bikes	We encourage this commenter to review the final decision to see the mountain bike opportunities that will ultimately be provided under the Travel Management Plan. There were 8 alternatives considered in the analysis that varied in terms of the trails that would be restricted to mountain biking. The prohibition to mountain bikes on the Hyalite Creek and the East Fork of Hyalite Trails under Alternative 4, and the prohibitions on mountain biking in the Wilderness Study Area in Alternatives 5 and 6 were included to be responsive to certain issues. They facilitate the analysis and disclosure of effects and provide a clear basis for choice among options.
Ninia Baehr		879	Manhattan	Americans are becoming less physically active and more overweight and unhealthy. We should be doing everything we can to promote walking, x-c skiing and other physical activities. Keeping our recreational environments safe and enjoyable for healthy physical activity is important.	Non-Motorized (General)	Opportunities for cross-country skiing, hiking and mountain biking are provided under any of the alternatives studied in detail.
Lois Drobish		499	Kalispell	I urge the Forest Service to manage motorized vehicle use. I have not only been startled by, but endangered by motorized vehicles…	Non-motorized (General)	One of the purposes of the proposed Travel Management Plan (Alternatives 2 through 7-M) is to restrict wheeled motorized vehicle use to designated roads and trails. Routes not designated for such uses will provide opportunities for hikers, bikers and stock users whom desire non-motorized settings.
Donald M. Hart		531	Bozeman	...be as conservative as you possibly can restricting our forests to preserve them in their most natural state. We are wasteful users of just about all of our resources. We, unfortunately, as a society will ruin what we love most.	Non-motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that motorized use is a legitimate use of the National Forest. This does not mean however, that OHV use cannot or should not be managed, controlled, and/or restricted from some parts of the Forest to provide non-motorized recreation settings and/or protect other resource values.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Although the rationale for the preferred alternative states that allocation will not be based on miles of trail or volume of use, the DEIS makes it clear that non-motorized users outnumber all motorized users combined by roughly nine to one. The allocation of trails in the Bozeman front country, both by quantity and by quality of experience, does not reflect this proportion. A fair and balanced separation of uses is a major issue, as the allocations described above overwhelmingly favor motorized use, particularly motorcycle use.	Non-Motorized (General)	There are a number of factors that will influence the final determination of where motorized opportunities will be provided, including existing and projected recreation demand. However, there is no attempt to allocate trail miles in proportion to user statistics (whether reliable or not). This approach would not account for factors such as: (a) the greater lengths of trail needed to provide for half or full day rides for motorized users versus half or full day hikes. (b) Deliberate or natural temporal separation of uses. (c) Non-motorized users that don't necessarily object to sharing trails with motorized users. (d) Maintaining desired motorized opportunities on routes where there are no compelling reasons not to.
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453	Livingston	More than any other backcountry forest use, ATVs and motorcycles infringe on the rights and enjoyment of others through excessive noise, exhaust fumes, and trail degradation. People and wildlife suffer as a result. Just because motorized users choose an activity that is loud, destructive, and requires a lot of space, does not mean that they should be given a greater portion of the forest than their numbers would warrant.	Non-Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that motorized use is a legitimate use of the National Forest. However, in Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of the time of this EIS preparation, motorized use is restricted from some trails to provide non-motorized recreation settings and/or protect other resource values. However, there is no attempt to allocate trail miles in proportion to estimates on volume of use. This approach would not account for factors such as: (a) the greater lengths of trail needed to provide for half or full day rides for motorized users versus half or full day hikes. (b) Deliberate or natural temporal separation of uses. (c) Non-motorized users that don't necessarily object to sharing trails with motorized users. (d) Maintaining desired motorized opportunities on routes where there are no compelling reasons not to.
Ron Orton		1472b	Bozeman	Hikers create a significant amount of impact to trails, they cut switch backs, make trails wider by walking side by side and walk around wet areas trampling vegetation. If there are restrictions based on erosion, hikers should be restricted as well.	Non-Motorized (General)	We found no compelling reason to restrict hiking on the Forest.
David Adams		1915	West Yellowstone	Why not have a 'hiking only' trail in each district in the Gallatin? Many of us love to hike. Needless to say, we do not enjoy hiking behind stock and outfitters on a hot summer day.	Non-Motorized (General)	In Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of the time of this EIS preparation, motorized use is restricted from some trails to provide non-motorized recreation settings and/or protect other resource values.
Roger A. Jenkins		752	Bozeman	Outside of existing Wilderness areas, it is hard to find a watershed (and thus, noise-shed) where a horse-person or hiker or cross-country skier does not have to "share", during some portion of the year, either the trail in the valley, or the ridgeline above the	Non-Motorized (General)	In Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of the time of this EIS preparation, motorized use is restricted from some trails to provide non-motorized recreation settings and/or protect other resource values.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				valley, with a motorized vehicle. ...there is an appalling absence of recognition of a fundamental truth: that the values sought by individuals engaging in self-propelled travel... ...are in conflict with the values of those who engage in motorized recreation.		
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Proposing to close more than 50% of the trails that are presently open to motorcycles is unacceptable and does not meet the management concept for multi-use, as required by law.	Motorized (General)	The rationale for use restrictions are described in the Record of Decision for the Travel Management Plan. There is no provision in the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960 (P.L. 86-517) that precludes the Forest Service from establishing restrictions on motorized vehicle travel. Section 4 of the Act defines "multiple use" as follows: "'Multiple Use' means the management of all the various revewable surface resources of the National Forests so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the needs of the American people; making the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions; that some land will be used for less than all of the resources; and harmonious and coordinated management of the various resources, each with the other, without impairment of the productivity of the land, with consideration being given to the relative values of the various resources, and not necessarily the combination of uses that will give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output" [id. at Sec. 4(a)]. In summary the concept of multiple use does not mean that all activities must be managed for in all parts of the Forest.
Steven Gehman		662		Regarding the North Bridgers, Goal 1 would allow for "some" motorcycle/ATV use; what exactly does this mean, and how will it be enforced? Goal 2 specifies "no goals for winter recreation'; what does this mean?? Anything goes?? I believe that it is irresponsible to have no specific goals for this area and I suggest establishing non-motorized use as the direction for this area (to protect wildlife habitat) in both summer and winter.	North Bridgers	In general the goals included for summer and winter recreation use in each travel planning area can be best understood by reviewing the specific route-by-route decisions. This describes how the Forest Service intends to achieve these goals. For North Bridgers Travel Planning Area, Goal 1, that allows for "some" motorcycle/ATV use, recognizes that this area has limited opportunities but there was no reason to outright prohibit the use. The statement that there are no winter recreation goals for this area means that the Forest Service does not intend to manage this area for snowmobiling or cross-country skiing. We simply don't view this area as one that provides these opportunities.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Keisy Hammond		1016	Gallatin Gateway	Porcupine Buffalo Horn: The damage or potential for damage to this area is great if we don't restrict motorized now.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	There were a variety of opinions expressed about how this area should be managed. Key issues affecting the decision include: (a) The fact that it mostly lies within the Hyalite/Porcupine-Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area and we need to maintain the wilderness character as it was in 1977. (b) It falls within the recovery zone for the threatened grizzly bear and travel management should provide and maintain good core habitat. (c) It contains important winter habitat for wolverine and elk that must be considered. Refer to the Record of Decision rationale for this Travel Planning Area and also the discussions about the Hyalite/Porcupine-Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area.
Kirk Horn		237	West Yellowstone	Also more and more camp fires are left burning, even during stage 2 fire restrictions. Because of increasing build up of ladder fuels and drying timber, the rather remote location, and difficulty to patrol, wild fire ignition should be considered.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	This issue was considered in the EIS but was not studied in detail (see page 2-11 of the FEIS). According to the Forest's fire occurrence records, there have only been four fires (Forest-wide) caused by vehicles since 1980. Operating motorized vehicles off designated trails and road systems has been prohibited on public lands administered by the Gallatin Forest since 2001 (Forest Order 01-11-00-01, 2001). In addition, motorized vehicle use is typically restricted during times of high fire danger through the implementation of the Forest's fire restrictions and Forest closure process. Unwanted fire starts from the improper use of motorized off-road vehicles off designated trails and roads are rare, and therefore this was not considered a significant issue for travel management planning.
Kester Romans		29		How thought out was this plan and who were its authors. Was there a strategic mineral and metals survey? Was there an honest timber assessment? These are national security concerns.	Process	The analyzed consequences of the travel plan alternatives on extractive uses (i.e. timber production, livestock grazing and mineral development) of the Gallatin National Forest are disclosed beginning on page 4-9 of the FEIS. In summary this was not considered to be a significant issue because the travel management plan does not prohibit road construction or access for these purposes. A list of those involved in the preparation of the FEIS can be found in Chapter 5 of that document. Becki Heath, the Gallatin Forest Supervisor, is the Responsible Official for the decision.
Paige Dringman		1008	Big Timber	NEPA requires a cumulative effects analysis and this document simply does not accomplish that objective.	Process	The cumulative effects analysis conducted for the FEIS was expanded considerably from what was presented in the Draft EIS. Each issue discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS contains a sub-section addressing cumulative

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						effects.
Ken Zahn		1634	Bozeman	The EIS is not an activity-oriented proposal that should be administratively managed under 36CFR215 procedures but, instead under 36CFR219. It is inappropriate for the USFS to have changed regulatory management oversight from 219-series regulations to 215 regulations 2 to 3 years after publication of the NOI without revising the NOI to alert the public. This is an important issue because of the much stricter requirements on what constitutes appropriate and legally sufficient comments under 36CFR215 as compared to the provisions of 36CFR219.	Process	The regulations at 36 CFR 219 address National Forest System Land and Resource Management Planning. The regulations at 36 CFR 215 address Forest Service administrative appeal procedures for decisions on projects implementing a land and resource management plan. Both of these rules have applicability to the travel planning process and decision. The Forest Plan amendment decisions of the Travel Plan may also be appealable under the regulations at 36 CFR 217 which applies to decisions to approve, amend, or revise a forest plan. This comment has been addressed in more detail through letters available in the travel planning project record. Refer to documents 05.07.26_Response to Zahn and 05.08.15 Christiansen_Zahn Issues.
William and Carol Oriel		288		This proposal needs more actual study and an external review and vetting by outside comment noninvested parties. There needs to be more hard data from independent sources. The process document has a cavalier use of language, and a cavalier approach to affected communities, actual people, though sometimes small in number, living with and using the public resource. Do a better job of documentation before making or even suggesting changes like this.	Process	We believe that the travel planning process fully complies with all applicable laws, regulations and policy. Public participation opportunities were extensive. Seven alternatives were studied in detail to sharply define the issues and provide a clear basis for choice among options. Lastly, in the Final EIS and Record of Decision we attempted to avoid words that some commenters' interpreted as indicators of bias against certain user groups.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Because the forest has decided to complete travel planning before it completes its Forest Plan revision, we are concerned that future land management options, which should be made in the forest plan, will instead be determined in the travel plan. It appears that the Gallatin's timing of travel planning and forest planning are in reverse order, and we are concerned that the travel plan will then drive forest plan revision and not the other way around.	Process	The travel management plan focuses on public access and use of the Forest's road and trail system. It also addresses the area that would be available for certain types of off-route travel. The Travel Plan does not address the management of other resources that typically are addressed in a forest plan revision process. Caution was used in developing alternatives so as not to inadvertently make a decision in principle about the management of these other resources. Most would agree that the travel planning process is a long and complex one. Including it in the revision process would only make it more complicated. Also, in January of 2005, new forest planning regulations at 36 CFR 219 were published. Under these regulations, Forest Plans will be broader in scope and will not include final agency action decisions. The Travel Plan does make final agency decisions and therefore would not be appropriate for a

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						revised Forest Plan.
Roger Jenkins		752		It seems clear, that without a compelling rationale based on: scientific assessment of impacts of various travel modes on the land, wildlife, and flora, as well as humans (e.g. How far does the noise of the two cycles snowmobile engine travel in a snow -- carpeted forest); a demonstrated understanding of the incompatibility of certain forms of travel and recreation; and a reasonable balance between watersheds/noise-sheds where motorized travel/recreation is featured and those where animal- and or self propelled travel is featured to the exclusion of motorized travel and giving the potential for litigation because of the lack of clearly presented, science based rationale, the only reasonable action is to withdraw the plan and start over, using the aforementioned criteria as a starting point. Trying to fine-tune a fundamentally flawed approach doesn't solve anything.	Process	We believe that the travel planning process fully complies with all applicable laws, regulations and policy. Public participation opportunities were extensive. Seven alternatives were studied in detail to sharply define the issues and provide a clear basis for choice among options. The rationale for the final Travel Management Plan is documented in the Record of Decision. The "noise" issue was addressed in the FEIS beginning on page 3-414.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		The process signaled that it was predisposed to maximize motorized closures right from the start with the benchmark that showed virtually everything closed. We request that the process be corrected to adequately and reasonably address the needs of the public for multiple-use and motorized recreation.	Process	The Benchmark was developed as one possible option for management of travel on the Forest. Providing a proposal was important to facilitate specific public comment and it is also a requirement of NEPA. The FEIS studies 7 alternatives in detail which vary considerably in terms of the amount of motorized use that would be provided. The Forest Service does have a good inventory of system roads and trails. This network was used and displayed on maps associated with the Benchmark and the alternatives. Attempting to inventory all other, user-built routes was not considered practical. In lieu of this, we had specifically asked the public to identify any additional routes that they knew of and believed should be considered for possible summer motorized uses.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		Why are motorized recreationists the only ones to give up recreational resources in every action? This is more evidence that the DEIS and GNF travel plan process is being largely driven with a bias towards motorized recreation. We respectfully request that this unacceptable bias be corrected by restarting the process and making internal adjustment to assure the public that a fair process and decision are made.	Process	The purpose and need (objectives) for a travel management plan is discussed in Chapter 1 of the FEIS. The Starting Benchmark was presented to the public at the beginning of the process as one possible option to achieve these objectives. Based on the comments received and an initial assessment of environmental impacts, 5 additional alternatives were developed to respond to the issues and represent differing public

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						views on how travel should be managed. The Draft and Final EIS studied 7 alternatives in detail which varied considerably in terms of the motorized use opportunity that would be provided. Alternative 1 would not restrict motorized use to designated routes and therefore represents the more motorized end of the range of alternatives. The Record of Decision provides the rationale for the Final Travel Plan and includes a section that explains why other alternatives considered were not selected.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		All trails slated for substantial upgrades or new construction should be subject to thorough NEPA analysis. Any trail upgrade using a trail dozer in particular needs to be subject to NEPA analysis.	Process	Final agency decisions for road and trail construction, reconstruction, maintenance and decommissioning are not being made through this Travel Management Plan. Route-by-route decisions are limited to the types of uses and season of use that is appropriate for each road and trail (including potential new routes) on the Gallatin National Forest. Although programmatic objectives are being adopted for construction and reconstruction work, further analysis in compliance with NEPA will be required before the specific projects are carried out. Refer to page 1-15 of the FEIS for a discussion of the scope of decisions to be made through the Travel Management Plan.
Kenneth C. Zahn		554	Bozeman	I request that the FS, in compliance with its NEPA regulations; (1) Prepare and publish a revised NOI and schedule covering the entire DEIS; (2) Revise the DEIS to (a) integrate the economic analysis, (b) correct discrepancies between closure matrix charts and maps, (c) add the more current draft and final report analyses of road/trail inventories and impacts to sensitive resources that are known the Agency but are not accounted for in the DEIS analysis or accounted for in the reference citations of the DEIS; then recirculate the DEIS by issuing an NOA that provides for the full 90-day comment period promised in the 2002 Federal Register Notice and so needed to assure substantive public input.	Process	We believe that the travel planning process fully complies with all applicable laws, regulations and policy. Public participation opportunities were extensive. Seven alternatives were studied in detail to sharply define the issues and provide a clear basis for choice among options. More detailed consideration of these claims of NEPA violations can be found in the travel planning project file. Refer to documents 05.07.26_Response to Zahn and 05.08.15 Christiansen_Zahn Issues.
William and Carol Oriel		288		This proposal needs more actual study and external review and vetting by outside, noninvested parties. There needs to be more hard data from independent sources. The summary document has a cavalier use of language, and a cavalier approach to affected communities, the actual people, though sometimes	Process	We believe that the travel planning process fully complies with all applicable laws, regulations and policy. Public participation opportunities were extensive. Seven alternatives were studied in detail to sharply define the issues and provide a clear basis for choice among options. Lastly, in the Final EIS and Record of Decision

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				small in number, living with and using the public resource. Do a better job of documentation before making or even suggesting changes like this.		we attempted to avoid words that some commenters' interpreted as indicators of bias against certain user groups.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		There is "massive" confusion regarding the delineation of specific travel planning areas on the Gallatin Forest. There are now innumerable Management Areas as per the original Forest Plan. Overlaid on these will now be about 40 travel planning areas, of which the relationship to the original management areas is unknown. Also overlaid on these include the grizzly bear units and subunits, and lynx analysis areas. Within the areas for the Travel Plan, the analyses for travel routes was different for each species, as well. It was extremely difficult to understand how these different analysis areas relate to one another. And problem areas could not be dealt with because some evaluations were done at a scale much larger than the Travel Planning unit. This whole process needs to be not only simplified, but tied back to the original management area prescriptions of the Forest Plan.	Process	The delineation of travel planning areas was done primarily for organization purposes. For example, we believed it would be easier to find specific roads, trails, and areas of interest if we divided up the 1.8 million acre Gallatin National Forest into subunits and then provide an index map to where they were located. Individual route tables in the Detailed Description of Alternatives and the Detailed Description of the Decision are separated by the travel planning area in which they are located. The delineation was also done based on logical transportation cells. For example, breaks between areas were done where there were changes in the primary route of access or because there were differences in higher level management direction governing travel (e.g. designated wilderness vs. non-wilderness). These same delineations may or may not also represent logical analysis units for the evaluation of environmental impacts. There is no single system of delineating analysis areas that works for all resource issues and therefore they vary for the effects disclosure on each topic addressed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. In addition, the management area (MA) delineation in the Gallatin Forest Plan (1987) was based largely on vegetation type and the planned resource uses of that vegetation. For example, lands delineated as MA 8 contained forested stands where the emphasis was on timber production. Generally, these lands were not delineated around the transportation network and also were not place-based. Therefore they were not useful for planning recreation travel. This is not to say that Forest Plan MA direction was ignored in travel planning. The Travel Plan had to be consistent with relevant MA standards or those standards had to be amended consistent with the NFMA regulations at 36 CFR 219. For further information on consistency with the Forest Plan, refer to the discussion of each significant issue in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. Discussions of the Forest Plan amendments can be found in Chapter 1 of the FEIS beginning on page XX, Chapter 3 of the FEIS beginning on page XX, and in Appendix A.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
James H. Brown		1209		All the travel areas should be examined and site specific trail planning should take place with public input from groups familiar with each area. The directives regarding trails and travel planning in the 3-state OHV EIS done in smaller groups, area by area, would produce a fair and diverse travel plan. As each area travel is decided, the district can adopt the directive.	Process	From the outset of travel planning one of our objectives was to get input from groups and individuals who actually use specific roads and trails. We believe that we accomplished this objective. This was not the only factor in the equation however. Public input had to be weighed along with projected environmental consequences and other higher level direction applicable to the management of travel. Because the Forest Service is charged with the management of the Gallatin National Forest, we believed that we had to also retain the responsibility for the Travel Plan decision. There were a variety of reasons we chose to conduct travel planning for the entire Forest versus taking smaller sub-areas one at a time. These reasons included, but were not limited to: (1) The comprehensive approach provided a better understanding of how site-specific choices may affect the mix of recreation opportunities available Forest-wide. (2) It resulted in a more efficient approach to the analysis of effects, particularly cumulative effects. (3) It provided a more appropriate context in which to consider the effects and compare them to objectives to provide for a broad spectrum of recreation opportunities.
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness Society	1882	Bozeman	The process by which the GNF travel plan revision is developed and implemented, as well as the adequacy of the Forest Service's evaluation of environmental impacts to guide these actions, must be viewed within the overall context of NEPA's basic purpose: to ensure protection of natural resources.	Process	As supported by the FEIS and the Record of Decision we believe that we fully met NEPA's underlying purpose and mandate. The Travel Plan will provide for a variety of recreation opportunities while protecting other resource values.
Ken Salo	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1916		The 1,000+ pages of EIS and supporting documents plus 21 over-sized maps is not a reasonable way to present the travel plan to the public. The information as presented is way beyond the 300 page limit established by NEPA. In order to be a reasonable burden on the public, we suggest that the Travel Planning process be broken into 8 to 12 regions within the forest and that one region be processed per year.	Process	We realize that there is a tremendous amount of documentation associated with the travel planning process. This is the primary reason we provided 3 extended comment periods. All of the alternatives studied in detail, except Alternative 7, have been available to the public since August of 2003. We felt that the time provided between then and when comments on the Draft EIS were due in August of 2005, was adequate for the public to identify the options being considered for the management of travel on routes and areas that were of interest. There were a variety of reasons we chose to conduct travel planning for the entire Forest versus taking smaller sub-areas one at a time. These reasons included, but were not limited to: (1) The comprehensive

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						approach provided a better understanding of how site-specific choices may affect the mix of recreation opportunities available Forest-wide. (2) It resulted in a more efficient approach to the analysis of effects, particularly cumulative effects. (3) It provided a more appropriate context in which to consider the effects and compare them to objectives to provide for a broad spectrum of recreation opportunities. Lastly, we disagree that breaking the process into 8 to 12 individual projects would have been better for the public. There would not have been a proportionate reduction in the amount of documentation since roughly the same issues would need to be addressed for each individual area. It would have also lengthened the overall time it would take to complete the planning effort Forest-wide (i.e. 10 to 15 years) thus asking the public for almost continuous involvement.
Tammy Sturgis		114		A comprehensive trail inventory of the GNF has not been completed and is not included with the formulation of the new GNF TP. This inventory was required to be done in compliance with the 2001 three state OHV rule.	Process	The Forest Service does have a complete inventory of all system trails. Attempting to conduct an inventory of all non-system routes was not considered practical or necessary. Alternative 1 would allow for off-route motorized travel and therefore it would be legal under that option to ride ATV's and motorcycles on non-system routes outside of Wilderness or other previously restricted areas. In addition, the initial Starting Benchmark travel plan alternative displayed system trails and other routes that we knew of. During the comment period provided at that time we asked users to identify any other routes, not displayed, that they believed should be considered in the planning process.
Russ Ehnes	MTVRA	837		The numerous travel areas should be examined and site specific trail planning should take place with public input from groups familiar with each area. The directives regarding trails and travel planning in the 3-state OHV EIS done in smaller groups, area by area would produce a fair and diverse travel plan. As each area travel is decided, the district can adopt the directive.	Process	From the outset of travel planning one of our objectives was to get input from groups and individuals who actually use specific roads and trails. We believe that we accomplished this objective. This was not the only factor in the equation however. Public input had to be weighed along with projected environmental consequences and other higher level direction applicable to the management of travel. Because the Forest Service is charged with the management of the Gallatin National Forest, we believed that we had to also retain the responsibility for the Travel Plan decision. There were a variety of reasons we chose to conduct travel planning for the entire Forest versus taking smaller sub-

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						areas one at a time. These reasons included, but were not limited to: (1) The comprehensive approach provided a better understanding of how site-specific choices may affect the mix of recreation opportunities available Forest-wide. (2) It resulted in a more efficient approach to the analysis of effects, particularly cumulative effects. (3) It provided a more appropriate context in which to consider the effects and compare them to objectives to provide for a broad spectrum of recreation opportunities.
Kirk Walton		1601	Wilsall	I am opposed to the FS accepting and counting, "Canned Responses", generated by various pressure groups. In many instances the FS has cited numerous responses as evidence that a particular view is correct. If a person is not concerned enough to create his or her own response and merely parrots the line issued to them, I cannot believe they are viable comments.	Public Involvement	Despite our efforts to inform people that the public comment opportunities provided were not "voting" processes, we still received numerous form letters, postcards and petitions in an effort to show us the numbers of people that supported one point-of-view or another. The most effective and useful comments we received were original and substantive. They helped us understand how people were actually using the National Forest, where the desirable recreation opportunities were, and helped us identify the key issues to be analyzed and considered.
Catherine Weeden		1604		Lionhead - from the winter map, it appears that the GNF is planning to reduce the area it will recommend as Wilderness in the next Forest Plan. This is not proper. If the GNF is going to change the boundary of the Recommended Wilderness, it should be done during the Forest Plan revision.	Roadless, Wilderness, Recommended Wilderness	Management of travel within the Lionhead recommended wilderness was a subject of considerable discussion and thought. Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of the time this EIS was prepared would allow snowmobiling in a portion of this area and also allow mountain bike use on included trails. The rationale for allowing snowmobiling into part of the area was that we believed the area was inviting to snowmobilers and that establishing a restriction at the boundary of the recommended wilderness would not be manageable. The primary reason that travel management of this area required so much thought and debate was that Congress never acted on the recommendation and the Gallatin Forest Plan does not specifically preclude mechanized uses. There is also no legal or policy requirement that prohibits such use as long as the wilderness character is maintained. However, management of travel in the Lionhead recommended wilderness has not been decided as of the time this response to comment was written. There are valid reasons to preclude mechanized uses as the commenter suggests. Please refer to the Record of Decision for the final determination of how

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						travel in this area is to be managed and the rationale for it.
Brad Carpenter		491	Gallatin Co.	I am a concierge at a lodge, and I speak with hundreds of people a day, mostly out of state tourists. I have been here a year, not once has anyone come to me asking if they could get directions to drive an ATV on a trail or road in the mountains of Montana. They come and ask me where they can hike, where they can fish, where they can see a beautiful undisturbed place that they cannot see anywhere else.	Roadless, Wilderness, Recommended Wilderness	The Recreation section of Chapter 3 of the FEIS shows that the demand for non-motorized activities are expected to grow at a greater rate than the demand for motorized uses. However, there is still a demand for both and an objective of the Travel Plan is to provide for a full spectrum of recreation opportunities. Please refer to the sections discussing "decision criteria" and "general rationale" in the Record of Decision.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Another concern is in relation to wilderness recommendations. By permitting motorized use in roadless areas within the travel plan which might otherwise be considered for wilderness recommendation, it appears that the determination of whether to recommend an area for wilderness designation in the forest plan will be at least partially determined by its disposition in the travel plan.	Roadless, Wilderness, Recommended Wilderness	Our first response to this comment is that roadless lands were considered for possible recommendation as wilderness in the last forest planning process. With the exception of the Lionhead and Republic Mountain areas, the decision at that time was to not recommend that they be designated. That being said, we did believe it was important to understand how travel management decisions may affect the possibility of future wilderness designation of roadless lands and therefore this issue was addressed in the EIS. See FEIS, pages 2-7, and 3-497.
	Natural Recourses Conservation Service	248	Bozeman	(We are concerned about maintaining access to the following snow course and SNOTEL sites on the) Livingston Ranger District: Bald Ridge snow course and South Fork Shields SNOTEL site, west side of the Crazy Mountains. Rock Creek Meadow snow course, Rock Creek Drainage	Shields	Snow survey sites installed and used by the Natural Resources Conservation Service on the Gallatin National Forest are managed via a special use permit. The permit specifies the mode of access allowed to these sites. The travel plan decision, regardless of the alternative selected, would not affect this authorization.
Jon Wade		514	Cheyenne, WY	(Form)	Snowmobiles	No response needed.
Lyle P. Jones		518	Buckley, WA	(Form)	Snowmobiles	No response needed.
Gary Enger		529	Aumsville, OR	(Form)	Snowmobiles	No response needed.
Steve Grediagin		530	Bend, OR	I live in Bend, OR and we have seen some closure in the Dutchman Flat area by Mt. Bachelor ski area. As a direct result of these closures the FS has increased their man hours tenfold in the area just to keep the area signed and patrolled for a perceived conflict between snowmobilers and cross-country skiers. I ski and snowmobile and have not seen any incidents of any kind..... Our FS went through the motions of listening to everyone's comments and	Snowmobiles	We cannot speak to the circumstances or situation in the Dutchman Flat area near Mt. Bachelor Ski Area in Oregon that lead the Forest Service to establish an area restriction on snowmobiles. We can say that the comments we solicited on the proposed Gallatin National Forest Travel Management Plan was not a solicitation of "votes." We were very interested in understanding public views on the desirable routes and areas that provide specific recreation opportunities (including

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				closed it anyway even though the large majority of comments was from the snowmobilers against the plan.		snowmobiling and cross-country skiing). The decision however is not limited to a consideration of public desires. Other resource issues (such as providing winter habitat for lynx and wolverine) and other higher level direction applicable to travel must also be considered.
Eric Shaffer		535	South Range, WI	(Form)	Snowmobiles	No response needed.
Ken Zahn		1634		The role of the Forest Plan versus the Travel Plan in codifying TPA-specific standards, etc., is unclear.	Standards and Guidelines	At the beginning of the travel planning process and through the Draft EIS, the Forest Service proposed to amend the Travel Management Plan into the Gallatin Forest Plan. In other words the goals, objectives, standards and guidelines would become Forest Plan direction for the management of travel. This changed based on the revision of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) Regulations at 36 CFR 219 in January of 2005. Revised Forest Plans prepared after that date will no longer make decisions for final agency action. The standards and route-by-route decisions of the Travel Plan are considered final agency decisions and therefore are no longer proposed as an amendment to the Forest Plan. To help clear up the confusion, it should be understood that the Travel Plan is developed to be consistent with applicable laws, regulations, policy, and Forest Plan direction (except as amended by the Travel Plan decision). In other words, one only need to refer to the Travel Plan to understand all direction governing travel on the Gallatin National Forest.
Becky Johnson		1353	Gardiner	The prospect of the eliminating the road density standards and replacing them with "trust us" guidelines is alarming. Considering that the Forest Service repeatedly "suspends" or makes "site-specific amendments" to the currently existing standards in order to allow grossly inappropriate projects and activities on the Gallatin forest, I have absolutely no faith whatsoever that any "good will" or common sense will be exercised when applying these toothless guidelines.	Standards and Guidelines	Alternatives 2 through 7-M replaces the road density standard of the current Forest Plan with specific decisions concerning motorized use. Open road density, motorized route density, and the habitat effectiveness rating is a result of the Travel Plan decision. The preferred alternative also includes a standard (see Standard D-6 for Alternative 7-M) that precludes establishment of new permanent motorized routes not designated for such use in the Travel Management Plan. In other words, the direction of the Travel Management Plan is to maintain, over time, the motorized route density established by the decisions for use of each road and trail. For more information, refer to the discussion of amendments and grizzly bears in the Record of Decision, and Chapter 1, Chapter 3 (pages 3-214 to 3-224 and 3-254 to 3-329) and Appendix A of the FEIS.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
David Keltner	Bear Creek Council	1366		Bear Creek Council is frustrated by the proposed "goodwill" routing standards put forward by the US Forest Service. At the present time and agency that has been found guilty of widespread violations of them and environmental protection laws should not be asking for goodwill from the public.	Standards and Guidelines	We assume that this comment is related to the proposed amendment of the Forest Plan, under Alternatives 2 through 7-M to remove the Forest Plan standard for "elk effective cover" (i.e. HEI of 70% or open road density of no more than 3/4 mile per square mile, Forest Plan, page II-18). The Travel Plan makes the on-the-ground decisions for the specific roads and trails where public motorized use is permitted, therefore an open road density standard is no longer needed. Retaining this standard would only make sense if there were yet future decisions to be made on where motorized use would be allowed. The preferred alternative also includes a standard (see Standard D-6 for Alternative 7-M) that precludes establishment of new permanent motorized routes not designated for such use in the Travel Management Plan. In other words, the direction of the Travel Management Plan is to maintain, over time, the motorized route density established by the decisions for use of each road and trail. For more information, refer to the discussion of amendments and grizzly bears in the Record of Decision, and Chapter 1, Chapter 3 (pages 3-214 to 3-224 and 3-254 to 3-329) and Appendix A of the FEIS.
David Keltner	Bear Creek Council	1366		Bear Creek Council urges the U. S. Forest Service to keep all roading standards and the Elk Habitat Effectiveness Index in place until replaced by a Gallatin National Forest-wide measurable, scientific system replaces it in the forest plan.	Standards and Guidelines	The Travel Plan makes the on-the-ground decisions for the specific roads and trails where public motorized use is permitted, therefore an open road density standard is no longer needed. Retaining this standard would only make sense if there were yet future decisions to be made on where motorized use would be allowed. The preferred alternative also includes a standard (see Standard D-6 for Alternative 7-M) that precludes establishment of new permanent motorized routes not designated for such use in the Travel Management Plan. In other words, the direction of the Travel Management Plan is to maintain, over time, the motorized route density established by the decisions for use of each road and trail. For more information, refer to the discussion of amendments and grizzly bears in the Record of Decision, and Chapter 1, Chapter 3 (pages 3-214 to 3-224 and 3-254 to 3-329) and Appendix A of the FEIS.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association	1440		Why are seasonal restrictions on motorized routes not listed as a guideline similar to or included with Guideline A-11 for mountain bikes and horses?	Standards and Guidelines	Applicable seasonal restrictions on horse, bike and motorized uses are specifically identified for each road and trail in the route tables presented for each travel

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Madison-Gallatin Chapter					planning area in Chapter II of the Detailed Description of Alternatives. Guideline A-11 was proposed under Alternatives 2 through 7 in the DEIS to highlight the blanket spring restrictions on stock and mountain bikes (which are new), and to show that district rangers have the latitude to open those routes earlier, to bikes and stock only, if weather and facility conditions permit. In Alternative 7-M of the FEIS, this guideline was not adopted in favor of identifying specific routes (about a dozen) where spring stock and mountain bike restrictions would apply.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Standard M-8, Wildlife, should also include motorized winter routes. Additional motorized winter routes and/or acreage should not be constructed or opened without amending the travel plan, as they could affect ungulate winter range, bear denning sites, wolverine or lynx habitat, or other wildlife values.	Standards and Guidelines	The Travel Management Plan proposed to restrict summer motorized wheeled vehicle travel to designated routes. Snowmobiling was not and therefore it was not included in Standard M-8. Regardless, changes in area restrictions for snowmobiling would require modification of the Travel Management Plan. Note that in the FEIS, the Travel Management Plan is no longer proposed to be amended into the Forest Plan and Standard M-8 is included as Standard D-6 in Alternative 7-M. See Chapter 1 of the FEIS, and Chapter I of the Detailed Description of Alternatives.
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	619a		Additional Option #3) Guideline M-11-Riparian Habitat. Any new roads or trails (parallel or connector routes) to be established within riparian areas will maintain a buffer of 600 meters adjacent to stream border where terrain and topography make this logistically feasible. MWF strongly supports all riparian protections and finds the specific parallel trails recommended for the Hyalite trail system unnecessary and potentially destructive to the fishery from sedimentation and erosion issues. MWF encourages the adoption of this option.	Standards and Guidelines	Under Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of the preparation of this EIS, this optional guideline was not adopted because any future proposal for new roads or trails would undergo site-specific analysis in accordance with NEPA prior to decision. Appropriate mitigation measures and design criteria would be identified and incorporated at that time. In general a broad forest-wide guideline directing a 600 meter buffer may be too restrictive in some situations and not sufficient in others. Therefore we believe that is more appropriate to explore options that would protect the riparian resource at the time site-specific actions are proposed. Also, it should be noted that the proposed parallel trail in the Hyalite drainage was not included in Alternative 7-M.
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	619a		Additional Option #6) Consider adding the following guidelines for management of peregrine falcon nesting habitat in the Gallatin River TPA. Guideline: Peregrine Falcon. Manage travel corridors so that vehicles, pedestrians and other users do not stop or remain in the immediate area identified as an essential habitat site. Guideline: Peregrine Falcon:	Standards and Guidelines	Under Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of the preparation of this EIS, these optional guidelines were not adopted because they were overly restrictive and may not be necessary every year. The Forest Service has the latitude to execute temporary area restrictions to protect nest sites or other resources on an as needed basis. Including these guidelines could require us to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Restrict rock climbing on cliffs during nesting season as a spatial and temporal buffer. Approximate nest chronology extends from March 15 to August 15.		impose fairly severe restrictions on rock climbing and other uses, when the situation doesn't call for it.
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	619a		Additional Option #7) Consider modifying proposed Forest-wide Goal G to add "snags and dead and down woody habitat" as a key habitat within which healthy vegetative conditions should be provided. In addition, consider including the following guideline for maintenance of snag habitat. Guideline G-3: Snag Habitat. Increase law enforcement and education of snag importance. Add snag/woodcutting topics to environmental education programs. Use education in concert with on-the-ground firewood gathering restrictions (avoid cutting snags that already show evidence of bird use, leave all snags >20 inches dbh, leave snags with broken tops, avoid cutting trees that show evidence of heart rot). Continue to provide Gallatin National Forest firewood cutting instructions handout with each firewood permit.	Standards and Guidelines	Goal G, which is now Goal H in Alternative 7-M was modified to include "snags and dead and down woody habitat" as a key habitat. Beyond that, the suggested direction for snag habitat was not included in the travel plan alternatives studied in detail because they were considered to be outside the scope of this analysis and decision. The concern over loss of snags and down woody debris is relevant to firewood gathering, not travel on the road and trail system. If loss of this habitat is of concern in a specific area it would be more appropriate to establish a firewood cutting restriction than to close all vehicle access to that area.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		The EPA is generally supportive of the "other options for consideration" travel planning area goals, objectives and guidelines, and we encourage the GNF to consider their adoption. We are particularly supportive of Guideline M-11.	Standards and Guidelines	Under Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of the preparation of this EIS, the optional objectives, standards and guidelines were not adopted because any future proposal for new roads or trails would undergo site-specific analysis in accordance with NEPA prior to decision. Appropriate mitigation measures and design criteria would be identified and incorporated at that time. We have learned through implementation of the current Forest Plan that imposing standards and guidelines as programmatic direction is not always an effective means of meeting resource objectives. While they are simpler they are not tailored to fit the variety of situations that may be encountered across the National Forest. At the site-specific level we can often find a standard to be overly restrictive and unnecessary, yet it still must be followed. We believe that it is more appropriate to explore options that would protect the riparian and certain other resources at the time site-specific actions are proposed.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353	Willow Creek	The number of documents developed by the Gallatin Forest to define management direction on these public lands will make it extremely difficult for the general public to understand direction, let alone be	Standards and Guidelines	It did require considerable documentation to describe the options for travel management under seven alternatives and disclose the results of environmental analysis in accordance with NEPA. To help those that did not want

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				able to access all of the associated documents. It seems that the only reason the Gallatin Forest has made this process so confusing to the public is to delete all existing road density standards/management from the current Forest Plan.		to wade through descriptions of all seven alternatives we included a separate document that only described the DEIS preferred alternative (Alternative 7-M). There was also a DEIS Summary for those who only wanted an overview. Chapter 1 of the DEIS, which described the proposed action and the purpose and need, clearly identified amendment of the Forest Plan to remove existing standards as part of this proposal.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		The rationale for deleting all current road density standards in this Amendment are vague and not supported by information provided in your Travel Planning documents; current Forest Plan direction that was not deleted is being ignored. The agency has claimed that big game standards cannot be used because of various problems. Then the documents use existing management recommendations to define levels of roads and security for elk. If these recommendations, including from the Regional Office, are not suitable for establishing threshold levels of roads and security for big game, then why are they suitable for use in your descriptions of the various alternatives?	Standards and Guidelines	The reasons for proposing Forest Plan amendments were described in the DEIS in Chapter 1, beginning on page 1-10 and in Appendix A. The projected consequences of these amendments were discussed beginning on page 3-108. These sections include discussions of proposed amendments to Forest Plan road density standards. The Travel Plan makes the on-the-ground decisions for the specific roads and trails where public motorized use is permitted, therefore an open road density standard is no longer needed. Retaining this standard would only make sense if there were yet future decisions to be made on where motorized use would be allowed. The preferred alternative also includes a standard (see Standard D-6 for Alternative 7-M) that precludes establishment of new permanent motorized routes not designated for such use in the Travel Management Plan. In other words, the direction of the Travel Management Plan is to maintain, over time, the motorized route density established by the decisions for use of each road and trail. That being said, amending this standard from the Forest Plan does not mean that underlying basis for it has no validity for the purposes of analysis of effect. That is why open motorized route density, etc. was still used as a method of comparing the significance of effects of each alternative on wildlife related issues in the EIS.
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		There is no analysis of the potential impact on many management areas where the "no new roads" standard will be deleted. There are many projects that may require new temporary roads, such as ongoing fuels management. The current road restrictions in many management areas are being dropped. Of course the analysis claims that this will be insignificant as per impact, but this is questionable. Since the agency has found a need to	Standards and Guidelines	The reasons for proposing Forest Plan amendments were described in the DEIS in Chapter 1, beginning on page 1-10 and in Appendix A. The projected consequences of these amendments were discussed beginning on page 3-108. These sections include discussions of proposed amendments to Forest Plan road density standards. The Travel Plan makes the on-the-ground decisions for the specific roads and trails where public motorized use is permitted, therefore an

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				eliminate these "no new road" standards, there is likely a reason. The potential long term impact on wildlife needs to be evaluated.		open road density standard is no longer needed. Retaining this standard would only make sense if there were yet future decisions to be made on where motorized use would be allowed. The preferred alternative also includes a standard (see Standard D-6 for Alternative 7-M) that precludes establishment of new permanent motorized routes not designated for such use in the Travel Management Plan. In other words, the direction of the Travel Management Plan is to maintain, over time, the motorized route density established by the decisions for use of each road and trail. It is true that Alternatives 2 through 7-M would not prohibit the construction, reconstruction, or opening of roads for temporary administrative activities or projects, such as timber harvest or fuels reduction, but that was never the intent of the current Forest Plan standard either. It would not make sense for the Forest Service to restrict their ability to meet other multiple use objectives of the National Forest by prohibiting the necessary means of access. Any future proposals for roads associated with administrative or project activity would undergo site-specific analysis consistent with NEPA to address and consider the consequences to potentially affected wildlife habitat.
Noreen Breeding		454		ROS standards must not be abandoned, especially in light of the heavy reliance on ROS for analyzing recreation in the DEIS. What will be used in place of ROS to determine if a variety of quiet and motorized opportunities are available? Without ROS, what will prevent a non-motorized trail from being changed to a motorized trail in the future?	Standards and Guidelines	The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) standards of the Gallatin Forest Plan do not accomplish what the commenter is asking for. The standards do not distinguish between semi-primitive motorized and semi-primitive non-motorized uses and the mapped management area delineations are often too small to exclusively manage for a specific recreation setting. Instead of ROS standards, Alternatives 2 through 7 proposed to include an objective within each travel planning area (TPA) that targeted a specific amount of opportunity (i.e. miles of road or trail) to be provided for each mode of travel. Partly in response to comments such as this one however, Alternative 7-M was changed. Under this alternative, the miles of opportunity objective would be dropped from each TPA and an objective that targets management consistent with a referenced ROS map was added. See Objective 1-1 (and 2-1) for winter uses under the programmatic direction set for each TPA under Alternative 7-M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Noreen Breeding		454		Guideline A-11: Why are seasonal restrictions on motorized routes not included in this section? They are printed in the alternative tables for each trail and road. Please add the requirement for seasonal restrictions on motorized travel.	Standards and Guidelines	Applicable seasonal restrictions on horse, bike and motorized uses are specifically identified for each road and trail in the route tables presented for each travel planning area in Chapter II of the Detailed Description of Alternatives. Guideline A-11 was proposed under Alternatives 2 through 7 in the DEIS to highlight the blanket spring restrictions on stock and mountain bikes (which are new), and to show that district rangers have the latitude to open those routes earlier, to bikes and stock only, if weather and facility conditions permit. In Alternative 7-M of the FEIS, this guideline was not adopted in favor of identifying specific routes (about a dozen) where spring stock and mountain bike restrictions would apply.
Noreen Breeding		454		Standard M-7: Increase the stream buffer to 600 meters as suggested in the "Other Options for Consideration" section of Chapter 2 of the DEIS.	Standards and Guidelines	Under Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of the preparation of this EIS, this optional guideline was not adopted because any future proposal for new roads or trails would undergo site-specific analysis in accordance with NEPA prior to decision. Appropriate mitigation measures and design criteria would be identified and incorporated at that time. In general a broad forest-wide guideline directing a 600 meter buffer may be too restrictive in some situations and not sufficient in others. Therefore we believe that is more appropriate to explore options that would protect the riparian resource at the time site-specific actions are proposed. Also, it should be noted that the proposed parallel trail in the Hyalite drainage was not included in Alternative 7-M.
Noreen Breeding		454		Standard M-8: Why are winter motorized routes not included in this Standard? Additional winter motorized routes and/or acreage should not be allowed to be constructed or opened without amending the Travel Plan. Also, why are the trail users being locked into place? Adaptive Management is more suited to this type of situation where increasing numbers of users and vehicles in the coming 20 years make decisions complex.	Standards and Guidelines	The Travel Management Plan proposed to restrict summer motorized wheeled vehicle travel to designated routes. Snowmobiling was not and therefore it was not included in Standard M-8. Regardless, changes in area restrictions for snowmobiling would require modification of the Travel Management Plan. The standard was considered to be needed such that if and when there may be changed conditions, any site-specific proposal for travel management is considered within the context of the overall mix of opportunities targeted by the Travel Plan. Note that in the FEIS, the Travel Management Plan is no longer proposed to be amended into the Forest Plan and Standard M-8 is included as Standard D-6 in Alternative 7-M. See Chapter 1 of the FEIS, and Chapter I of the Detailed Description of Alternatives.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Brian Hawthorn	Blue Ribbon Coalition	1196		Road density should be a guideline, not a strict standard. This re-evaluation will surely lead to recommended changes proposed by the motorized recreational community for keeping proposed trail closures open, connecting trails for loop rides, and designating routes in areas that were open to motorized recreation but are being proposed for closure in the DEIS.	Standards and Guidelines	We assume that this comment is in reference to proposed Standard M-8 on page I-13 of the DEIS which precludes increases in summer public motorized routes without first modifying the Travel Management Plan. This direction was included as a standard because the route-by-route decisions to designate roads and trails for motorized use were based, in part, on consideration of the effects to wildlife habitat that results from those decisions (i.e. the resultant motorized route density). Therefore it is important to maintain that motorized route density over time, rather than allowing for site-specific changes to be made, outside the context of the Travel Plan.
Greg Beardslee		737		Lizard Lakes: this destination should remain open to mountain biking. It is not in any way inside the wilderness area.	Taylor Fork	This was an error on the maps provided with the DEIS and it has been corrected for the FEIS and final decision.
Cassie Munson		125	Big Sky	The map for alternative 7 shows Mtn bikes prohibited on trail 33 Cinnamon Crk. To Taylor Fork/Albino Lake. The route tables show it open to Mtn Bike. I would strongly protest the closure of this to Mtn bikes. It is a fun ride that is not too crowded by bikes.	Taylor Fork	This was an error on the maps provided with the DEIS and it has been corrected for the FEIS and final decision.
Kemp O'Neill		1469	Livingston	As far as conflicts on trails, you always speak about them, but you never are specific as to each case. You ask us to be trail specific, now I would like you to be conflict specific.	User Conflicts	We believe user conflict is a behavioral issue that is more of a problem with the individuals involved than it is with different user groups. Once a travel plan decision is made our objective is to provide better user information so that they know the types of uses to expect on given routes. We believe that unexpected encounters with different users on routes contributes to diminished experiences. We also believe that areas of motorized use don't always provide the type of recreation experience non-motorized users are looking for. Therefore, many of the alternatives include motorized use restrictions for the primary purpose of providing non-motorized settings for hikers, skiers, stock users, and mountain bikers. Refer to the Recreation section in Chapter 3 of the FEIS and the Rationale sections of the Record of Decision for more discussion.
Todd Orr		1473		After riding 2700 miles of trail during both weekday and weekends over the last two seasons, I experienced no conflicts with other users. When users are friendly, courteous, and use common sense, nearly all conflicts can be avoided. I believe proper signing at trailheads will also help eliminate	User Conflicts	We believe user conflict is a behavioral issue that is more of a problem with the individuals involved than it is with different user groups. Once a travel plan decision is made our objective is to provide better user information so that they know the types of uses to expect on given routes. We believe that unexpected encounters with

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				most conflicts. Trail users should be educated and informed on the types of use to expect on each trail, and the proper etiquette and common courtesy that is expected between different users. I believe this would go a lot farther than closing numerous trails only to result in the crowding and overuse of others.		different users on routes contributes to diminished experiences. We also believe that areas of motorized use don't always provide the type of recreation experience non-motorized users are looking for. Therefore, many of the alternatives include motorized use restrictions for the primary purpose of providing non-motorized settings for hikers, skiers, stock users, and mountain bikers. Refer to the Recreation section in Chapter 3 of the FEIS and the Rationale sections of the Record of Decision for more discussion.
Brian Hawthorn	Blue Ribbon Coalition	1196		The DEIS fails to justify motorized route closures made on the basis of conflict with site-specific data. "Social Conflict," or the desire to create "exclusive, quiet non-motorized uses of the GNF trail system outside of Wilderness" is one of the key factors in all of the alternatives, especially the preferred alt. The decision to create exclusive use for any recreational community is arbitrary, capricious and unrelated to facts on the ground.	User Conflicts	We believe user conflict is a behavioral issue that is more of a problem with the individuals involved than it is with different user groups. Once a travel plan decision is made our objective is to provide better user information so that they know the types of uses to expect on given routes. We believe that unexpected encounters with different users on routes contributes to diminished experiences. We also believe that areas of motorized use don't always provide the type of recreation experience non-motorized users are looking for. Therefore, many of the alternatives include motorized use restrictions for the primary purpose of providing non-motorized settings for hikers, skiers, stock users, and mountain bikers. Refer to the Recreation section in Chapter 3 of the FEIS and the Rationale sections of the Record of Decision for more discussion.
James H. Brown		1209		Education and a management effort to set expectations for multiple uses on the trail systems should be the goal. Rather than perpetuate the "user conflict" that the organized quiet trails community has promoted for the past 10 years. Using area closures as a management technique does not meet the needs of the existing users of the area. Fair, diverse and equitable solutions should be a major goal.	User Conflicts	We believe user conflict is a behavioral issue that is more of a problem with the individuals involved than it is with different user groups. Once a travel plan decision is made our objective is to provide better user information so that they know the types of uses to expect on given routes. We believe that unexpected encounters with different users on routes contributes to diminished experiences. We also believe that areas of motorized use don't always provide the type of recreation experience non-motorized users are looking for. Therefore, many of the alternatives include motorized use restrictions for the primary purpose of providing non-motorized settings for hikers, skiers, stock users, and mountain bikers. Refer to the Recreation section in Chapter 3 of the FEIS and the Rationale sections of the Record of Decision for more discussion.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Russ Ehnes	MTVRA	837		The alternative directive to segregate every different category of forest visitor is out of touch with reality. Education and a management effort to set expectations for multiple uses on the trail systems should be the goal.	User conflicts	We believe user conflict is a behavioral issue that is more of a problem with the individuals involved than it is with different user groups. Once a travel plan decision is made our objective is to provide better user information so that they know the types of uses to expect on given routes. We believe that unexpected encounters with different users on routes contributes to diminished experiences. We also believe that areas of motorized use don't always provide the type of recreation experience non-motorized users are looking for. Therefore, many of the alternatives include motorized use restrictions for the primary purpose of providing non-motorized settings for hikers, skiers, stock users, and mountain bikers. Refer to the Recreation section in Chapter 3 of the FEIS and the Rationale sections of the Record of Decision for more discussion.
Verne W. House		1347	Bozeman	I object to the idea that priority be given to motorized use of the trails on the west side of the Bridgers. Motorized use creates negative externalities for nonmotorized use whereas nonmotorized use does not detract from the motorized experience. Giving equal access (does not) appear to be fair (in) that there will not be equal impact.	West Bridgers North	We're not sure where the notion that motorized use of trails on the west side of the Bridgers was given priority over non-motorized use comes from. While there were variations in opportunities provided by alternative the overall goal was to provide opportunities for both motorized and non-motorized recreation throughout the west side. In general non-motorized opportunities were emphasized in the West Bridger South Travel Planning Area.
Steven Gehman		662		Goal 1 emphasizes "low-level motorcycle use on certain trails", how will you ensure that use remains at a low level?? Won't objective 1(2) promote increased levels of use, by providing a loop trail? I would like to see the elimination of motorized uses on the entire west side of the Bridgers, especially if Fairy Lake area is going to be a heavily motorized sacrifice zone. I suggest the establishment of a non-motorized directive for the West Bridgers North and West Bridgers South in winter, instead of the "no winter recreation use goal" specified in this document.	West Bridgers North	One aspect of travel planning that isn't often well-understood is that the Travel Plan itself provides direction and guidance for the Forest Service, not the public. Implementing the Plan requires us to take management action. Even the route restrictions of the Plan first require us to cut a special order before users are obligated to comply with them. This is the perspective one should have in reviewing goal statements such as Goal 1 in the North Bridgers Travel Planning Area which emphasizes management for low-level motorcycle use. What this statement tells future managers is that while the intent is to provide motorcycle opportunities, it is not intended that they make significant investments to attract more users or reconstruct the trails to provide high-end motorcycle experiences. This principle also applies to winter uses. Since the west side of the Bridgers has poor snow conditions, the fact that there is no winter recreation goals means that the Forest

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Service will not invest or manage for such use in this area. Under Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of this EIS preparation, establishing an area restriction on snowmobiles on the entire west side was not considered necessary. It is not currently receiving a significant amount of use and the poor quality of opportunities provided there will likely continue to deter future use.
Shelly Watters and Steve Malmberg		1602		In the West Bridgers, Truman Gulch, Middle Cottonwood and the Foothill trails have become popular with the non-motorized users because of their proximity to town. Emphasizing motorized use of this area will contribute to increasing conflicts between user groups. In addition, vehicles will cause the introduction of noxious weeds into an area that is still relatively clean.	West Bridgers South	Alternative 7-M, the preferred alternative as of this EIS preparation, strives to manage the west side of the Bridger Mountain Range for a balance of motorized and non-motorized opportunities. While motorcycles will be allowed on the Middle Cottonwood Trail (#586), the Truman Gulch Trail (#535), the Limestone (Corbly Gulch) Trail (#544), and a portion of the Bridger Foothills Trail (#534), motorized use would be prohibited on the North Cottonwood Trail (#545), the Bridger Ridge Trail (#513), the Bostwick Trail (#536), the Jones Creek Trail (#533), the Sypes Canyon Trail (#531), the College M Trails (#511 and #512), and the remainder of the Bridger Foothills Trail (#534). In addition, the Forest Supervisor wants to consider time share options on the Sypes Canyon, Limestone (Corbly Gulch) and Middle Cottonwood Trails through a collaborative effort after the Travel Plan decision is made. Time share on these trails would provide for days of the week, or weeks within the summer season where hikers could use these routes without encountering motorcycles. This balance of opportunities on the West Bridgers seems fair and accommodates demand for half-day/evening motorcycle rides as well as hiking, biking and horseback riding in a non-motorized setting. Lastly, the potential introduction of noxious weeds was not a significant factor in the choice among alternatives. While the EIS discussion of this issue (beginning on page 3-350 of the FEIS) shows that motorized vehicles can spread invasive weeds, there are limited studies on the effects of non-motorized uses. In other words there is insufficient evidence to conclude that foot, stock or mountain bike use do not have just as much potential to spread weeds as do ATV's and motorcycles. In absence of closing the entire Forest road and trail system to all types of use, weeds will continue to have to be dealt with through user

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						education and treatment programs.
Donald Lovely		758		A couple of editing comments: Chapter I -- 2 the last bullet you may want to include something like: " Forest Service employees or Forest Service employed contractors". Chapter III-9, be Cabin Creek July 15 date doesn't agree with the detailed date on chapter II-40…. It has a September 15 closure shown on the Cub Creek Trail.	Standards and Guidelines	Thank you. These errors have been corrected for Alternative 7-M and will also be corrected in the final Travel Management Plan and Record of Decision. Note however that the fall motorcycle closure dates may have changed for the Cabin Creek area trails in the final decision from what was presented in Alternative 7 of the Draft EIS.
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness Society	1882		The decision should establish specific, measurable, and enforceable threshold levels that trigger automatic closures where the impacts caused by OHV use-regardless of whether such use is legal or illegal-exceed the level or type of impacts disclosed in the underlying decision and impact analysis documents. Such closures would be automatic, immediate, and would not require additional NEPA analysis.	Standards and Guidelines	We appreciate this suggestion but don't believe it would be practical, if even possible, to identify specific, measurable thresholds that could be applied across the Forest. As evidenced by the disclosure of effects for many of the issues discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS, and the section "Consideration of the Issues" in the ROD, it is even difficult to identify specific thresholds at which a certain level of use shifts from resulting in acceptable impacts to unacceptable impacts. For wildlife related issues in particular, there is a sliding scale of effects (i.e. the greater the level of human use, the greater the effect, and vice versa). Determining at what point on this sliding scale increases in use become unacceptable is a judgment call and there would be a variety of opinions on where that breakpoint is. Therefore we believe that if unexpected and/or unacceptable resource impacts are discovered from public recreation travel, then it is best handled through a site-specific proposal and analysis to change the Travel Management Plan.
Mike Klostrich		122	West Yellowstone	The first area is the Black Sands area I feel that a closure of the area in general is fine, but I would like to see the road to the area kept open in the winter for viewing only, it is a very beautiful spot to ride your snowmobile to and sit and view nature.	South Plateau	The Black Sands Road (#1716) would remain open to snowmobiles in all alternatives.
Levi Rugheimer		771	Bozeman	Closing trails is bad management and unacceptable.	Motorized (General)	We respect this commenters opinion, but encourage her to read the rationale for the Travel Management Plan decision in the Record of Decision (ROD). This describes the variety of reasons that the Forest Supervisor found to warrant use restrictions on many trails across the Forest.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Bear Canyon TPA is another important potential linkage zone in the forest. Small animals are taking advantage of a culvert underneath I-90. The GNF	Bear Canyon	Bear Canyon is recognized as an important wildlife habitat linkage area in the FEIS, Chapter 3 under the issue of Biological Diversity and Ecological

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				should limit road density on FS land in and around Bear Canyon, thereby facilitating the migration of larger animals, as DOT works towards creating a bridge or tunnel underneath I-90 to allow wildlife access to and from the Bridger Range.		Sustainability. The vast majority of roads in the Bear Canyon TPA are not under Forest Service jurisdiction (state, county, private, etc). This TPA contains only 1 mile of open public road, so there is very limited opportunity to adjust road density through this Travel Plan. However, through the travel planning process, we looked at total motorized route density (including motorized use on roads and trails) in evaluating effects to wildlife. Open total motorized route density varies across the range of alternatives from a low of 1.8 miles per square mile (Alt 5 and 6) to a high of 2.2 miles per square mile (Alt 1 and 2). Alternative 7M falls in between with a total open motorized route density of 2.0 miles per square mile, which would be a reduction over current conditions.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The DEIS recommendations include relocation of trails #440 and #458 off the ridge to provide a non-motorized corridor through the TPA. Until those trails are relocated, we suggest that the trails be designated non-motorized.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M would retain the objective to move trails #440 and 458 off the ridge to improve wildlife habitat security. Since this recommendation is an objective and not a standard, it does not preclude motorized use on these routes until the relocation is complete. However, Alternative 7M would include seasonal restrictions during spring and fall for #458 and spring for #440. These restrictions would reduce motorized disturbance during key migration periods, in an area recognized as an important wildlife habitat linkage area. It is still desirable to eventually move these routes to provide for improved wildlife habitat security along a major ridgeline, which could be used as a wildlife travel route throughout the year.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	The Bear Canyon TPA has a motorized route density of 1.18 miles per square mile. The recommendations include relocation of trails #440 and #458. Objective #440 and #458 will relocate those trails off the ridge to provide a non-motorized corridor through the TPA. Until those trails are relocated, we suggest that the trails be designated non-motorized (as #440 is for fisheries).	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M would retain the objective to move trails #440 and 458 off the ridge to improve wildlife habitat security. Since this recommendation is an objective and not a standard, it does not preclude motorized use on these routes until the relocation is complete. However, Alternative 7M would include seasonal restrictions during spring and fall for #458 and spring for #440. These restrictions would reduce motorized disturbance during key migration periods, in an area recognized as an important wildlife habitat linkage area. It is still desirable to eventually move these routes to provide for improved wildlife habitat security along a major ridgeline, which could be used as a wildlife travel route throughout the year.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	The goal for the Bear Canyon TPA includes an emphasis on motorized use. This goal is not compatible with the TPA's importance for wildlife connectivity. Objective 4(1) will help wildlife connectivity through this TPA by implementing seasonal motorized use restriction on area roads and trails to allow for wildlife security during the migration periods. Identifying those locations and seasonal restrictions now, during travel planning, will help initiate this process.	Bear Canyon	Although it is generally recognized that lower motorized use levels better facilitate wildlife movement, there is no evidence that all motorized use on backcountry roads and trails is incompatible with wildlife movement. Backcountry roads do not pose barriers to wildlife movement like wider, paved, high-speed/volume roads do. Habitat connectivity can be maintained while still allowing for some level of motorized use, and emphasizing motorized use in an area would not preclude achieving the goal to provide for wildlife migration and movement through the area. Seasonal motorized use restrictions are identified in Alternative 7M to reduce noise disturbance in the Bear Canyon TPA during key migration periods. Seasonal restriction dates are included in tables for each TPA.
David Gaillard		303		The EIS should provide more security from potentially harmful recreation in the Bozeman Pass area. Given the resources expended to protect the effects on wildlife from the highway and private lands in this area, the Gallatin should provide additional habitat security on its lands. ATV routes should be restricted from Bear Canyon-an area with terrible erosion problems anyway-and from the southern Bangtail's, and dirt bikes should be restricted from the southwest side of both the Bangtail and the Bridger Ranges.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M would provide more security from motorized use in the Bear Canyon TPA by reducing overall motorized route densities, restricting summer motorized use to designated routes, implementing seasonal restrictions during key time periods and stating an objective to move trail segments off of ridges in important wildlife movement areas. ATVs are restricted to designated routes in the Bear Canyon area in Alternative 7M and this alternative includes a standard that prohibits ATV (and other uses) in the Bear Canyon area until the trail system is of a condition that prevents adverse erosion and watershed damage. ATVs and motorcycles would still be allowed in the southern Bangtails, but again, seasonal restrictions would reduce motorized disturbance during crucial times. Motorcycle trail miles in the southwest Bridgers would be cut by more than half over current conditions under Alternative 7M.
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	1441		Biodiversity: road density in the Bear Creek area seems too high to offer much protection. This very well may be a result of its proximity to the interstate highway, and indeed wildlife highway passage issues have been addressed in previous documents and mitigation efforts are being implemented. Despite this, all efforts to secure this area from degradation are appropriate and should be explored.	Bear Canyon	The Interstate Highway is the major impediment to wildlife movement in the Bear Canyon area corridor. The vast majority of roads in the Bear Canyon TPA are not under Forest Service jurisdiction (state, county, private, etc). This TPA contains only 1 mile of open public road, so there is very limited opportunity to adjust road density through this Travel Plan. However, through the travel planning process, we looked at total motorized route density (including motorized use on roads and trails) in evaluating effects to wildlife. Alternative 7M

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						would provide more security from motorized use in the Bear Canyon TPA by reducing overall motorized route densities, restricting summer motorized use to designated routes, implementing seasonal restrictions during key time periods and stating an objective to move trail segments off of ridges in important wildlife movement areas.
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		Bear Canyon, in particular, is one of the most important potential linkage zones in the forest. Already, small animals are taking advantage of a culvert underneath I-90. The GNF should limit road density on FS land in and around Bear Canyon, thereby facilitating the migration of larger animals, as DOT works towards creating a bridge or tunnel underneath I-90 to allow wildlife access to and from the Bridger Range. The goal of managing the Bear Canyon TPA for motorized use is incompatible with the area's importance for wildlife connectivity. By instigating seasonal motorized use restrictions, and limiting road and motorized trail density in the area, Gallatin can maintain wildlife security during key migration periods.	Bear Canyon	Bear Canyon is recognized as an important wildlife habitat linkage area in Chapter 3 under the issue of Biological Diversity and Ecological Sustainability. The vast majority of roads in the Bear Canyon TPA are not under Forest Service jurisdiction (state, county, private, etc). This TPA contains only 1 mile of open public road, so there is very limited opportunity to adjust road density through this Travel Plan. Although it is generally recognized that lower motorized use levels better facilitate wildlife movement, there is no evidence that all motorized use on backcountry roads and trails is incompatible with wildlife movement. Backcountry roads do not pose barriers to wildlife movement like wider, paved, high-speed/volume roads do. Habitat connectivity can be maintained while still allowing for some level of motorized use, and emphasizing motorized use in an area would not preclude achieving the goal to provide for wildlife migration and movement through the area. Seasonal motorized use restrictions are identified in Alternative 7M to reduce noise disturbance in the Bear Canyon TPA during key migration periods. Seasonal restriction dates are included in tables for each TPA.
Steven Gehman		662	Bozeman	Regarding Bear Canyon, I believe that Goal 4 (to provide for wildlife migration and movement between the Gallatin Mountains and the Bridger-Bangtail Mountains) is the most important goal for this area, because of the role of this wildlife corridor in the big picture of regional wildlife conservation, and the Y2Y Conservation Initiative; therefore, Goal 1s (summer emphasis on ATV, motorcycle and mountain bike use) and Goal 2 (winter use emphasizing snowmobiles) are inappropriate, and contradictory to Goal 4; in the summer this movement corridor may be important to a wide range of ungulates and carnivores, and in winter it is likely important to	Bear Canyon	Bear Canyon is recognized as an important wildlife habitat linkage area in Chapter 3 under the issue of Biological Diversity and Ecological Sustainability. The Interstate Highway is the major impediment to wildlife movement in the Bear Canyon area corridor. Although it is generally recognized that lower motorized use levels better facilitate wildlife movement, there is no evidence that all motorized use on backcountry roads and trails is incompatible with wildlife movement. Backcountry roads do not pose barriers to wildlife movement like wider, paved, high-speed/volume roads do. Habitat connectivity can be maintained while still allowing for some level of motorized use, and emphasizing

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				mountain lions, lynx, and wolverines.		motorized use in an area would not preclude achieving the goal to provide for wildlife migration and movement through the area. Alternative 7M would provide more security from motorized use in the Bear Canyon TPA by reducing overall motorized route densities, restricting summer motorized use to designated routes, implementing seasonal restrictions during key time periods and stating an objective to move trail segments off of ridges in important wildlife movement areas.
Steven Gehman		662		Object 4 (1) c, "de-emphasize motorized use in this travel planning area to provide for secure wildlife migration and movement," should be an overriding objective for all alternatives in this area, and should be reflected in increased restrictions on motorized use on trails in the area.	Bear Canyon	Objective 4 (1) c applies only to Alternative 6. This objective was not carried forward in Alternative 7M, because the decision-maker believes that a motorized use emphasis is appropriate in the Bear Canyon TPA, and that this emphasis is not in conflict with the goal to provide for wildlife migration and movement within this corridor. Alternative 7M would provide more security from motorized use in the Bear Canyon TPA by reducing overall motorized route densities, restricting summer motorized use to designated routes, implementing seasonal restrictions during key time periods and stating an objective to move trail segments off of ridges in important wildlife movement areas.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	Motorized route density needs to decrease between the Porcupine area and Flattop Mountain in the Big Sky TPA. Closure of the First Yellowmule trail #162 would allow for more secure wildlife passage.	Big Sky	Alternative 7M would result in a slight increase in motorized route density (from 2.1 miles per square mile to 2.2 miles per square mile) over the existing condition in the Big Sky TPA. However, some existing routes would be closed to motorized use (Inspiration Divide Trail #8, and non-system ATV routes), and longer seasonal restrictions would occur on most routes designated for motorized use. Yellowmule Trail #162 would have seasonal restrictions during spring (until June 15) and fall (after September 14) that would enhance habitat security during these important wildlife movement and reproductive periods.
John A. Platt		322	Bozeman	it is also a concern that the area just south of Big Sky would remain open to ATVs, especially in light of the negative impacts to wildlife habitat caused by the excessive development around Big Sky.	Big Sky	The area south of Big Sky (Buck Ridge area) is incredibly popular for motorized recreation, and trails in this area are suitable for ATV use with minimal investment. While it is recognized that housing and commercial development, as well as high levels of motorized use, can have adverse effects on wildlife, it is sometimes better to concentrate these impacts, rather than spreading them out across more remote areas. ATV use has grown significantly in the area south of Big

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Sky in recent years, and wildlife are likely learning to adapt by avoiding the area during peak use periods. Since we cannot control development trends on private lands in the Big Sky area, we felt it was better to provide desirable motorized recreation opportunities in this area rather than to try to provide such opportunities elsewhere, where habitat security is inherently greater.
John A. Platt		322	Bozeman	it is also a concern that the area just south of Big Sky would remain open to ATVs, especially in light of the negative impacts to wildlife habitat caused by the excessive development around Big Sky.	Big Sky	The area south of Big Sky (Buck Ridge area) is incredibly popular for motorized recreation, and trails in this area are suitable for ATV use with minimal investment. While it is recognized that housing and commercial development, as well as high levels of motorized use, can have adverse effects on wildlife, it is sometimes better to concentrate these impacts, rather than spreading them out across more remote areas. ATV use has grown significantly in the area south of Big Sky in recent years, and wildlife are likely learning to adapt by avoiding the area during peak use periods. Since we cannot control development trends on private lands in the Big Sky area, we felt it was better to provide desirable motorized recreation opportunities in this area rather than to try to provide such opportunities elsewhere, where habitat security is inherently greater.
Thomas B. Wells		553		Yellowmule Trails #157 and 162 - don't permit snowmobiles. This could be part of the non-motorized, quiet, North-South connector between wilderness areas that would help enable animal migration.	Big Sky	Wildlife migration is typically a seasonal event, with major movements occurring during spring and/or fall months. Alternative 7M includes seasonal restrictions on ATV and motorcycle use for Trails #157 and 162, which would enhance habitat security during these important wildlife movement periods. Snowmobile use occurs during winter, when high energetic costs discourage long-distance movements for most wildlife species.
William Dayhuff		809		My concern is for less impact and stress upon the grizzly bears as well as other wildlife in the areas from Buck Ridge and Buck Ridge Trail accessed by the road at Jakes Horses to wilderness areas into Taylor Fork drainages and north up to Buck Ridge. I feel that there is so much nibbling away at the areas surrounding Big Sky, Yellowstone Club, Big Easy (Beaver Creek) that a more strict measure of restricting motorized use is needed to give wildlife an added buffer against the pressures of mans presence in this particular ecosystem pocket of the	Big Sky	The areas mentioned by the commenter (Buck Ridge, Taylor Fork, Beaver Creek) are indeed important habitat for grizzly bears as well as other wildlife. While it is recognized that housing and commercial development, as well as high levels of motorized use, can have adverse effects on wildlife, it is sometimes better to concentrate these impacts, rather than spreading them out across more remote areas. Buck Ridge and Beaver Creek are in the Big Sky TPA, although the majority of Beaver Creek is on private land and therefore not under the jurisdiction of this Travel Plan. Alternative 7M would

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				GNF.		result in a slight increase in total motorized route density (from 2.1 miles per square mile to 2.2 miles per square mile) over the existing condition in the Big Sky TPA. Although these numbers are higher than preferred for managing wildlife habitat, it is important to note that private roads make up the vast majority of motorized routes in this TPA. Under Alternative 7M, the Taylor Fork TPA would decrease in motorized route density from the current level of 1.1 miles per square mile to 0.8 miles per square mile, and most motorized routes would have longer seasonal restrictions than under current conditions.
Tom Pick		12	Bozeman	I hunted primarily along the east face of the Bridger Range north of Bozeman. I saw widespread use of OHVs - primarily 4 wheelers - in areas where historic logging practices have substantially reduced cover for big game like elk and mule deer. There were simply not a lot of places left for them to hide up there and the excessive use of these machines certainly didn't help reduce the security cover issue. My observations were that nearly all OHV use was for seat of the pants cruising; not just for access or to haul out harvested animals.	Bridger Canyon	The east face of the Bridger Range falls primarily in the Bridger Canyon and Fairy Lake TPAs. The Bridger Canyon TPA has limited public access and therefore little motorized use by the general public. Fairy Lake TPA is popular for OHV use. Under Alternative 7M, much of this use currently facilitated by past logging practices would be more strictly regulated. Alternative 7M would restrict summer motorized use to designated routes and prohibit off-route OHV use. The designated route system allows off-route travel by motorized vehicles only to access campsites within 300 feet of a designated route. It prohibits off-route travel for other purposes, including game retrieval. Many of the old logging roads in the Fairy Lake TPA are identified as "project roads", which are not designated for public motorized use under any alternative, but rather are targeted for decommissioning to revert the road bed back to a more natural condition.
Allen Milley		504	Belgrade	To protect dwindling numbers of wolverine, the Forest Service should make the roadless heart of the Bridgers off limits to motorized traffic.	Bridger Canyon	There are currently no statistically reliable population trend data for wolverines in southwest Montana or the Bridger Mountains, so there is no indication that wolverine numbers are dwindling in the Bridgers or elsewhere. However, the wolverine is classified as a Forest Service sensitive species, for which population viability is a concern. The commenter does not specifically identify the area they refer to as "the roadless heart of the Bridgers". Under Alternative 7M, there would be large blocks of land, particularly on the west side of the range, that contain no summer motorized designated routes. Winter motorized use would also be more limited under Alternative 7M than

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						currently, through the use of snowmobile area restrictions. Winter use restrictions would occur primarily on the east side of the Bridger range, but with some area restrictions at higher elevations on the west side as well. The lower elevation terrain on the west side of the range does not typically hold snow, so it is not suitable for snowmobile use.
Barbara Brown		740	Belgrade	Ross Pass to Hardscrabble Peak also needs to be the snowmobile free to protect the wolverine habitat.	Bridger Canyon	General wintering habitat for wolverines is found at higher elevations all along the Bridger range, while female reproductive denning habitat is thought to be more limited to certain aspects and elevations more prone to snow loading. The area from Ross Pass to Hardscrabble Peak provides good quality winter wolverine habitat, including some potential denning habitat. Alternative 7M would allow some snowmobile use to continue in this area, although with more restrictions than are present today. Snowmobile use in this area is likely to influence wolverine foraging patterns, and disturbance associated with snowmobile use could render potential denning habitat unsuitable for use by reproductive females. The Bridger range is a small, isolated mountain range, which considering the large home range sizes of wolverines, is probably occupied by only a few wolverines at any time. There is suitable foraging habitat available throughout the Bridger range, and there is potentially suitable denning habitat available in areas that would not be directly influenced by snowmobile use under Alternative 7M.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		With approval of the Bridger Bowl ski area expansion, and a possible open gate policy at the ski area, the currently remote South Fork Brackett is likely to see an increase in non motorized recreational pressure. This will bring concurrent impacts to an area viewed as having the most diverse wildlife in the entire Bridger Range.	Bridger Canyon	The approval of the Bridger Bowl Ski Area expansion and open gate policy were covered under separate NEPA and administrative decisions, and not part of the Travel Plan. Effects of Travel Plan Alternatives relative to winter use and impacts to wildlife are addressed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		We oppose an open gate policy at Bridger Bowl for this reason. The South Fork of Brackett Creek needs to be set aside for the wolverine, moose, bear, mountain lion and other wildlife which find refuge there.	Bridger Canyon	The open gate policy at Bridger Bowl Ski Area was a separate administrative decision, and not part of the Travel Plan. Effects of Travel Plan Alternatives relative to winter use and impacts to wildlife are addressed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS.
Shawn Regnerus		1497		Cabin Creek - even though this area is designated as special wildlife management area it has one of the l lowest percentages of protected wolverine habitat	Cabin Creek	The Cabin Creek TPA is recognized as providing high quality wolverine habitat, including reproductive denning habitat (DEIS, Ch. 3-476). Alternative 7M maintains the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				due to the fact that it is almost entirely open to unrestricted snowmobile use. This is unacceptable for an area the links the Madison Range to YNP.		Cabin Creek TPA as open for dispersed snowmobile use. Although existing literature strongly implies that winter recreation has potential for adverse impacts on wolverines, research on this species is limited, and we do not yet have hard data that allow us to quantify these impacts. The legislation that created the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area specifically allows snowmobiling in this area provided it is compatible with the protection and propagation of wildlife. Alternative 7M provides for winter habitat security in areas adjacent to the Cabin Creek TPA through snowmobile area restrictions in the Taylor Fork, Lionhead and Hebgen Lake Basin TPAs. The Hilgard and Monument Units of the Lee Metcalf Wilderness Area TPAs provide additional winter habitat security adjacent to the Cabin Creek TPA.
Jerome Onsager		955	Bozeman	To be nice to lynx trash the idea of a groomed loop from the Fairy Lake road to the Flathead Pass road. Much of that loop will pass through recent clear-cuts where the scenery won't significantly improve for about 25 years. There is only one semi-challenging play area along the way, it is less than 49 acres in size, it is above the designated route and it is therefore off-limits. There are no scenic vistas that cannot be seen from more pleasing vantage points just to the north of Fairy Lake. The loop does not lead to any significant destination. I have superimposed the wolverine denning habitat in the Fairy Lake vicinity over the snowmobile use areas and there seems to be no shortage of potential denning sites w/in 2-3 miles my favorite bowls. I agree that the Travel Plan must keep mtn goats and snowmobiles separated. Four high bowl between Ross Peak and Fairy Lake are rimmed w/ deep cornices of snow from the west side, the east-facing slopes accumulate more snow than across the ridge, the snow lasts longer in the spring than across the ridge. These bowls are not winter goat habitat. Snowmobilers could be allowed to play in the acres and acres of inviting open meadows to the north and northwest of Fairy Lake through the simple expediency of limiting them to elevations of 8500 feet or lower. That elevation would block the Sacajawea	Fairy Lake	Alternative 7M retains the groomed snowmobile route between Fairy Lake Road and Flathead Pass Road. Effects to lynx are disclosed in Volume 2, Chapter 3 of the FEIS. This groomed route was retained in Alternative 7M because it provides a different kind of recreation opportunity (groomed route vs. open play area) and because it provides access to open snowmobile areas below Ross Peak and around Fairy Lake. Suitable wolverine denning habitat exists in the Fairy Lake area and elsewhere in the Bridger range. Wintering mountain goats use habitat all along the ridge of the Bridger range from Flathead Pass south to Saddle Peak. Although they may not venture into deep snow in bowls with heavy cornices, goats can be disturbed and/or displaced from nearby habitat by snowmobile use in upper bowls. Alternative 7M allows for dispersed snowmobile use in limited areas below Ross Peak and around Fairy Lake. We considered using an elevation limit to keep snowmobile use below a certain level. However, we concluded that elevation would be difficult for the average recreationist to determine on the slope and would also be difficult to enforce.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				trail as well as the 3 saddles that currently allow access to the Frazier Lake basin, thereby preventing encroachment on goat habitat.		
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		TWS believes that It is essential for the west side of the Bridgers to remain motor-free to facilitate wildlife movement. The cumulative effects of the Bridger Bowl expansion, private land development, land exchanges and the travel plan make a non-motorized west side of the Bridgers biologically essential. This TPA should include a migration corridor goal similar to the Lionhead's which provides for wildlife connectivity between the Bridgers and Big Belts.	Fairy Lake	Although it is generally recognized that lower motorized use levels better facilitate wildlife movement, there is no evidence that all motorized use on backcountry roads and trails is incompatible with wildlife movement. Backcountry roads do not pose barriers to wildlife movement like wider, paved, high-speed/volume roads do. Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles only (no ATVs) on Middle Cottonwood (#586), Truman Gulch (#535) and Corbly Gulch (#544), along with the segment of the Bridger Foothills Trail (#534) that connects them. A seasonal motorized use restriction from April 1 through June 15 would add habitat security during the spring migration season for most wildlife. Spring is a key timeframe for wildlife movement in the Bridgers when ungulate species are moving from wintering grounds to calving/fawning areas and into summer range. Motorcycle trails in this area present a level of technical difficulty that appeals primarily to the most experienced riders. At the north end of the west Bridgers, the Johnson Canyon area would provide motorized recreation opportunities for ATVs and high clearance passenger vehicles as well as motorcycles. Here again, seasonal motorized use restrictions would add habitat security during the spring migration season (through June 15.) The North Bridgers area is recognized as an important wildlife corridor that provides habitat connectivity between the Bridger and Belt ranges (DEIS, Vol. 2, Chapter 3-63). However, since wildlife migration/movement corridors are important across the entire forest, and these corridors have not all been formally identified, the goal for maintaining these important habitat components has been made a Forest-wide goal (Goal F) in the FEIS. This allows us to continue to identify important wildlife corridors for future protection and enhancement.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301		We proposed a concentration of winter, motorized use in the Hardscrabble/Sacajawea/Ross Peak area on the East side at the Bridgers and the closure to snowmobiles on the entire west side of the Bridgers. The area includes a groomed snowmobile loop trail	Fairy Lake	Alternative 7M retains the groomed snowmobile route between Fairy Lake Road and Flathead Pass Road and also allows for dispersed snowmobile use in limited areas below Ross Peak and around Fairy Lake up to the ridge between Sacagawea and Hardscrabble Peaks.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				as well as numerous play areas and some of the preferred snowmobiling areas where snowmobile use currently exists. Please see in closed map for details and read the section on Wolverines for more information on will bring habitat concerns and needs.		Snowmobile area closures on the west side of the Bridgers include the upper elevation terrain from North Cottonwood Creek south to just past Sacagawea Peak. These were the places on the west side that were determined to be accessible by snowmobile from open areas on the east side, or from Johnson Canyon, which is part of the west Bridgers we believe is appropriate for snowmobile use. No additional area closures were included on the west side of the range because under normal conditions, most of the terrain on the west side is not suitable for snowmobile use.
David J. Jones		1357	Bozeman	Snowmobile use of the Bridgers should be stopped for the sake of Wolverines and other wildlife. Backcountry skiing (of which I do) should be stopped in the quadrants north and west of Fairy Lake for the same reasons.	Fairy Lake	Wolverines and other wildlife concerns were considered important issues in the Bridgers and elsewhere across the forest. However, we had to balance these concerns with providing reasonable recreation opportunities across the forest. The east side of the Bridger range has been tremendously popular for snowmobile use. Alternative 7M reduces the amount of open snowmobile terrain on the east side, while still allowing for snowmobile use in some of the most popular areas. On the west side of the range, only the Johnson canyon area would remain open and suitable for snowmobile use. While we recognize that snowmobile use can have adverse effects on wolverines and other wintering wildlife, we felt that allowing a limited amount of snowmobile use in highly popular areas was a good compromise, in that relatively secure winter habitat would still be available in other places throughout the Bridger range. Non-motorized recreation, such as backcountry skiing, can also have negative impacts on wildlife, but since these activities are more limited in scope, (i.e. one cannot travel as far on skis in a day as one can on a snowmobile), none of the alternatives studied in detail included restrictions on non-motorized foot travel.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We support the snowmobile-free proposal for the area south of Ross Pass, and also strongly favor the same designation for the rest of the roadless area north of Ross Pass. Motor-free management would protect mule deer winter range and mountain goat, lynx, and wolverine habitat at higher elevations.	Fairy Lake	Alternative 7M retains the groomed snowmobile route between Fairy Lake Road and Flathead Pass Road and also allows for dispersed snowmobile use in limited areas below Ross Peak and around Fairy Lake up to the ridge between Sacagawea and Hardscrabble Peaks. Snowmobile use on the east side of the Bridgers does not affect mule deer winter range. While we recognize that snowmobile use can have adverse effects on

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						mountain goats, lynx and wolverines, we felt that allowing a limited amount of snowmobile use in highly popular areas was a good compromise, in that relatively secure winter habitat would still be available in other places throughout the Bridger range. Non-motorized recreation, such as backcountry skiing, can also have negative impacts on wildlife, but since these activities are more limited in scope, (i.e. one cannot travel as far on skis in a day as one can on a snowmobile), none of the alternatives studied in detail included restrictions on non-motorized foot travel.
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	1441		Restrictions for ATVs and motorcycles in alternatives 4, 5, 6, 7 for trails #522 and 523 enhance elks security. MWF supports efforts for the access needs in the North Bridgers (page 1-8) to perfect trail access across checkerboard private in holdings.	Fairy Lake	The north end of the Bridger range is recognized as an important corridor for wildlife movement (FEIS, Vol. 2, Ch. 3 Biodiversity Issue). Alternative 7M retains the motorized use prohibition on trails #522 and #523 in the North Bridgers TPA.
Steven Gehman		662		The Fairy Lake portion of the Bridger Range represents important wildlife habitat that is used yearlong by a variety of ungulates (deer, elk and moose) and carnivores (bobcats, mountain lions, coyotes, and wolverines); the area already receives excessive motorized use, and this document allows for and even promotes greater levels of such use. I suggest that a reasonable and productive compromise would be to close the South, Middle, and North Forks of Brackett Creek to all motorized uses, and to allow those uses to occur from the North Fork north to the Flathead Pass Road.	Fairy Lake	The commenter is correct in that the Fairy Lake area provides important habitat for a variety of wildlife species. However, there is no suitable winter range in this area for deer or elk. Moose and mountain goats are the primary ungulate species using the area year-round. The Fairy Lake area has been tremendously popular for snowmobile use. Alternative 7M reduces the amount of open snowmobile terrain on the east side of the Bridger range, while still allowing for snowmobile use in some of the most popular areas. Alternative 7M allows some dispersed snowmobile use to occur in the North Fork, up to Ross Peak, and also in a limited area around Fairy Lake basin up to the ridgeline between Sacagawea and Hardscrabble Peaks.
Shawn Regnerus		1497		Opening the old logging roads between the fairy lake and flathead pass roads destroys what little habitat security remains in the area after the extensive clearcutting by BSL. This trail will also have the effect of driving elk on to neighboring private lands in an area that is already experiencing problems with low hunter harvest due to lack of public access and complaints of elk depredation by private landowners. At the very least this trail should be closed by Sept. 1.	Fairy Lake	Alternative 7M leaves only a limited portion of the old logging roads in the Fairy Lake TPA open to motorized use. The Carroll Creek and Break Roads would provide the only public motorized access routes between Fairy Lake and Flathead Pass Roads. These routes provide administrative access for management of the National Forest, as well as public access by ATV and motorcycle from June 16 through December 1. A short segment (approximately one mile) of the Break Road from Flathead Pass Road would also be open to public use in passenger vehicle from June 16 through October 14. All other old logging roads in the Fairy Lake TPA (approximately 28 miles) are considered "project" roads,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						which would not be designated for motorized use under Alternative 7M. Elk distribution is of concern in the Bridger range and is being addressed by Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks department through hunting regulations.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		We support the agency's decision to manage the Gallatin Crest Trail south of Windy Pass #96, south segment 2, as non-motorized, but the entire trail including #96 north segment 1, should be non-motorized. The Windy Pass area is unique on the forest providing important archeological sites as well as being an important area for Bighorn sheep. The Windy Pass Trail #82 should be non-motorized throughout the year in order to protect bighorn sheep habitat and reduce the likelihood of motorized trespass into the WSA and along the Gallatin Crest.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M keeps the Gallatin Crest Trail (#96) north of Windy Pass open for motorcycles, but prohibits ATV and other motorized uses. This trail segment is to be managed in a 'primitive' condition, which would provide a high-quality recreation opportunity for very experienced riders. Motorized use would be allowed for only a short period, from July 16 through September 4. This short season of use by a relatively low number of highly experienced riders would have minimal impacts to bighorn sheep. The use season would not overlap with bighorn lambing, migration or wintering periods, when disturbance effects would have the most adverse impacts. Under Alternative 7M, Windy Pass Trail #82 would become a non-motorized route. However, this change was designed to avoid possible user conflicts on this busy section of trail, and motorized access to Windy Pass (by motorcycle only) would still be provided via Trail #96 from Hyalite, as well as by Trail #187 from Moose Creek. So long as wheeled motorized vehicles stay on designated routes, there is no issue with motorized trespass into the WSA, because the Montana Wilderness Study Act does not prohibit motorized use in the HPBH WSA.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	The Gallatin Crest provides critical movement habitat. The trail south of Windy Pass is appropriately designated non-motorized and the rest of trail #96 should be closed to motorized use, as well. The area should also have objectives and goals for wildlife connectivity.	Gallatin Crest	The Gallatin Crest provides very valuable wildlife habitat, including important travel corridors. Although it is generally recognized that lower motorized use levels better facilitate wildlife movement, there is no evidence that all motorized use on backcountry roads and trails is incompatible with wildlife movement. Backcountry roads do not pose barriers to wildlife movement like wider, paved, high-speed/volume roads do. Under Alternative 7M, motorized use along the Crest would be limited to motorcycles only, and allowed for a short time period, from July 16 through September 4. Trails in this area include a level of technical difficulty that appeals primarily to the most experience riders. This short season of use by a relatively low number of highly experienced riders would have minimal impacts on most

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						wildlife species. Wildlife migration is typically a seasonal event, with major movements occurring during spring and/or fall months, when seasonal restrictions would prohibit motorized use along the Crest trails. Since wildlife migration/movement corridors are important across the entire forest, and these corridors have not all been formally identified, the goal for maintaining these important habitat components has been made a Forest-wide goal (Goal F) in the FEIS. This allows us to continue to identify important wildlife corridors for future protection and enhancement.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301		Snowmobiling in the area north of trail 120 and east of Ramshorn Lake should be prohibited. The area, Gallatin #3 Grizzly Bear Management Area, provides important grizzly bear habitat and den sights and overlaps with elk wintering grounds in the Gallatin Wildlife Management Area. The Forest Service should manage this area in a manner that is consistent with management prescriptions for grizzly bears and elk.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M contains snowmobile area closures in the area north of trail #120 and east of Ramshorn Lake. However, under this Alternative, snowmobiles could still access Ramshorn Lake from Buffalo Horn on trail #160. This access would be on a designated route (marked, not groomed) through the area closure. Reconfiguration for the snowmobile closure in this area was partly due to concern for disturbance and possible displacement of wintering elk. Designated routes through an area closure are expected to reduce impacts to elk since use on designated routes is more predictable than dispersed use and animals are better able to adapt to predictable human use patterns. There is no known grizzly bear den sites in the area generally described by the commenter; e.g. north or trail #120 and east of Ramshorn Lake, although there is suitable denning habitat available for bears in this general vicinity. The grizzly bear/snowmobile issue was addressed more thoroughly under the Grizzly Bear Issue for the FEIS in Volume 2, Chapter 3. It is possible that some den sites occur in the HPBH WSA. Under Alternatives 6 and 7M, 72% of the Gallatin mountain range would be closed to snowmobiling. This would be a substantial increase from the 27% that is closed presently.
Quint Gidley		1799		Snowmobile access in Alternative 7 is also somewhat disappointing to me. Emerald lake and Hyalite Lake are some of the few areas near Bozeman that it is possible to see no one or at least very few people and enjoy skiing and snowmobiling. I fail to see how wildlife is negatively affected by these activities as there is very little wildlife at that high of elevation in the winter.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M allows for dispersed snowmobile use in the Emerald Lake basin, but not in Hyalite. This configuration was determined to provide some high elevation snowmobile opportunity, while also protecting wilderness values and important winter wildlife habitat. High elevation, remote sites potentially provide important winter habitat for a number of wildlife species including federally listed threatened species (grizzly bear, lynx),

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						sensitive species (wolverine), management indicator species (marten), big game species (mountain goat, bighorn sheep), plus numerous small mammals and some bird species. Many of these species select remote, high elevation habitat for wintering areas to escape predation and/or to avoid disturbance from human activity. Another reason such areas are preferred wintering habitat by some species is that deep snow has excellent thermal regulatory properties, and also contributes to a foraging advantage for species adapted for travel in deep snow conditions; e.g. lynx, wolverine, snowshoe hare. Please refer to the ROD for the final winter use configuration in the upper Hyalite area and the rest of the HPBH WSA.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1191	Bozeman	The DEIS on page 3-301 states " Although noise associated with human travel is certainly a disturbance factor that can influence bird behavior, birds are able to adapt and habituate more quickly to mechanical (or motorized) noise than human presence (Knight and Gutzwiller 1995:104) Therefore, non-motorized use on and off trails may be more severe disturbance factor for birds than motorized restricted to designated routes." To limit motorized use and not more impactive human presence is discriminatory.	Issues	Although it is recognized that non-motorized use can affect wildlife, and in some cases as cited by the commenter, can be even more disruptive to wildlife than some types of motorized use, the comment takes one statement from the DEIS out of context and attempts to apply it over-broadly. The vast majority of research and literature on the effects of human use on wildlife, supports the conclusion that motorized use has greater impacts because of the distance that noise can travel, and because motorized users can travel further, faster and thereby have disturbance impacts over a much greater area and thus affect a larger number of individual animals. Further, motorized users often stop their vehicles and get off, thereby contributing non-motorized disturbance factors as well.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Suitable denning habitat for wolverine, which is a limiting factor, this clearly concentrated in the roadless core of the ranges on the Gallatin. Ensuring that these areas are protected from motorized incursions is the single most important land management tool for protecting wolverines. Restricting motorized use to designated routes and designated play areas for snowmobiles creates a level of predictability in human disturbance that will allow wolverines to locate to undisturbed denning areas while still allowing recreational use. For example, a comparison of wolverine thinning habitat and nonmotorized areas in the Bridgers shows the two large blocks of secure habitat could be created	Issues	Suitable denning habitat is not necessarily a limiting factor for wolverines on the Gallatin National Forest. Wolverines naturally occur at low densities across their range, and ongoing research (Inman et. al. 2005) suggests that females are likely territorial. With only a small number of reproductive females living within the forest boundary at any one time, there is adequate reproductive habitat available to support this cohort of the population. Both motorized and non-motorized recreation can cause disturbance, which may influence wolverine behavior. Human disturbance near occupied reproductive den sites is considered to have adverse impacts, with the potential to influence reproductive success of the wolverine population. The tendency for

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				simply by locating designated snowmobile play areas where summer motorized use also exists (see enclosed wolverine map).		reproductive wolverines to select remote areas for den sites makes it more difficult, though not impossible, for non-motorized recreationists to access denning habitat. Snowmobiles are restricted to designated routes where they are allowed through area closures, but are otherwise not restricted in open snowmobile areas. Under Alternative 7M 75% of potentially suitable wolverine denning habitat is within an area where dispersed snowmobile use is prohibited; i.e. either within a snowmobile area closure or within designated Wilderness.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		On the west side of the Bridgers, the area between Ross Pass and Flathead Pass appears to be particularly importance will terrain habitat. This region includes Corbly Gulch and North Cottonwood Creek, which accounted for 56% of wolverine camera and travel detections during six winters of study.	Issues	Alternative 7M includes a snowmobile area closure on the west side of the Bridger Range that extends from North Cottonwood Creek to Corbly Gulch at higher elevations. This closure was designed to protect winter wildlife habitat on the west side of the Bridgers, in areas thought to be accessible by snowmobile either from Johnson Canyon to the north or from the east side where snowmobiling is allowed. These areas are recognized as important wintering habitat for wolverines and other wildlife. The comment notes that 56% of wolverine detections were made in these areas during six winters of study. Caution should be used in interpreting these results, as the number of detections in these areas is directly proportional to the amount of effort invested, and not necessarily representative of wolverine use throughout the Bridger mountain range.
Robert M. Inman	Greater Yellowstone Wolverine Program, Wildlife Conservation Society	1849	Bozeman	The wolverine birthing period appears to begin in early February in the Yellowstone region, and we have documented natal den sites being used through the end of April. Minimizing human activity in natal denning habitat February 1 - April 30 would decrease the likelihood that wolverine reproductive rates could be impacted and population persistence compromised.	Issues	Seasonal restrictions were considered to minimize impacts in wolverine denning habitat. However, female wolverines might start looking for suitable den locations as early as December or January, and could still be using maternal dens or rendezvous cites later in the season. Therefore, we concluded that yearlong snowmobile restrictions were the best choice for protecting wolverine reproductive habitat. Under Alternative 7M 75% of potentially suitable wolverine denning habitat is within an area where dispersed snowmobile use is prohibited; i.e. either within a snowmobile area closure or within designated Wilderness.
Robert M. Inman	Greater Yellowstone Wolverine	1849		One of the activities that probably occurs most in wolverine denning habitat, especially maternal denning habitat which may be most sensitive is	Issues	No winter restrictions on non-motorized use were considered for this Travel Plan. However, the tendency for wolverines to select remote areas for reproductive

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Program, Wildlife Conservation Society			backcountry skiing. Magoun and Copelands (1998) experiences with maternal denning abandonment's suggest that single instances of non-motorized use near a maternal den could result in abandonment. Maternal dens that we have documented are in wilderness where snowmobiling does not occur. Minimizing human activity in maternal denning habitat April - June would decrease the likelihood that wolverine reproductive rates could be impacted and population persistence compromised. April and May are likely most critical as the young are les developed and may be more susceptible to mortality during movements associated with den abandonment.		den sites makes it more difficult, though not impossible, for non-motorized recreationists to access denning habitat. Non-motorized winter use such as backcountry skiing and snowboarding is often facilitated by motorized access; i.e. destination areas are reached by snowmobile. Since it is difficult to quantify this type of dispersed use, effects analyses assumed that impacts from such use are commensurate with levels of snowmobile access.
Robert M. Inman	Greater Yellowstone Wolverine Program, Wildlife Conservation Society	1849		It is unclear how the levels of low, moderate, and high impact acres have been determined. Considering wolverines, this analysis is most related to the question of foraging. What density was an area that is opened to dispersed use considered to be? It seems logical to call areas open to dispersed use (Cabin Creek for example) high impact. We have flown over the Cabin Creek area and any given square mile often has snowmobile tracks throughout the square mile at a relatively high density after a weekend of use. If areas of dispersed use were not quantified as high impact (>2.7mi/mi2) then the overall figures of acres in low, moderate, or hi impact may underestimate the amount of high impact areas.	Issues	Winter use was evaluated by two different factors: one looked at the proportion of areas open for dispersed snowmobile use relative to the amount of area where snowmobile use is prohibited. The other factor looked at densities of designated routes. Designated routes included plowed roads plus groomed or marked snowmobile/ski trails. Categories of use (e.g. low, moderate, high) were applied for designated routes because route density could be used as a measure of potential use. No attempt was made to differentiate use levels for dispersed snowmobiling. All areas open to dispersed snowmobile use were considered to have the potential for impacts in wolverine habitat. However, it was noted that not all areas managed as open for snowmobile use are actually accessible by machine. Some areas shown as 'open' for snowmobile use are either terrain limited or access limited by private land (DEIS, Vol. 2, Chapter 3-479).
Robert M. Inman	Greater Yellowstone Wolverine Program, Wildlife Conservation Society	1849		There is no mention of the potential impact of ski area expansion on wolverine populations. There are not, at this point in time, conclusive data to indicate whether or not wolverines avoid use of ski-areas or have reduced foraging opportunities due to human activity at a ski area. Reduced access to an area within a wolverine's home range a s result of human activity could lead to reduced carrying capacity of the landscape for wolverines. Reducing the carrying capacity for a species that already exists as such low densities as wolverines would probably have serious	Issues	Developed ski areas are considered as separate recreation facilities, and not part of the Travel Management Plan per se. Therefore, effects from developed ski resorts, both existing areas and proposed expansions, were addressed in the Cumulative Effects Assessment for wolverine (FEIS, Vol. 2, Chapter 3, Issue 22 Wolverine). The Project File contains additional detailed information regarding cumulative effects analyses.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				implications for population persistence.		
Robert M. Inman	Greater Yellowstone Wolverine Program, Wildlife Conservation Society	1849		Krebs et al (2004) summarized survival data from North America and suggest that twice as much non-trapped area is needed in proportion to trapped area because of source-sink dynamics. You have made the point that access influences ability to harvest. We don't often locate wolverines below 7,000 ft during winter, so a travel plan that approximates 2:1 ratio of non-accessible to accessible area above 7,000 ft. would likely benefit wolverine population persistence. However, wolverine are capable of large movements thus any small amount of area open to travel that allows access to the interior of a large closed area would still allow effective trapping of wolverines. Spatial juxtaposition of pen/closed areas is important. This impact to wolverine might be best addressed with collaborative planning efforts with MFWP and regard to areas open and closed to trapping.	Issues	The commenter provides information that was not considered in the DEIS. This information has been incorporated into the effects assessment for the FEIS, Vol. 2, Chapter 3.
Robert M. Inman	Greater Yellowstone Wolverine Program, Wildlife Conservation Society	1849		Our research results to date suggest that the single most important component regarding wolverine in the GNFs travel plan is that of coordination of reproductive refugia with entities that have authority over adjacent public lands or authority over the locations where trapping is allowed. Planning for wolverine would best be accomplished by establishing reproductive refugia that are placed and spaced approximately throughout the Yellowstone region. The goal of these refugia would be to provide an appropriate amount of stable, source habitat for wolverines that would facilitate essential genetic connectivity with other regional populations via effective reproduction and dispersal. Once refugia were in place and reproductive and dispersal rates measured, a sustainable harvest level could be developed; this would ensure that both the spatial distribution and levels of harvest are accommodating population persistence and genetic connectivity.	Issues	Under Alternative 7M, 75% of potentially suitable wolverine denning habitat within the Gallatin Forest boundary is in an area where dispersed snowmobile use is prohibited; i.e. either within a snowmobile area closure or within designated Wilderness. Much of the habitat adjacent to the Gallatin Forest boundary where we would expect to find wolverines includes high elevation, remote, and often protected land. Examples include Yellowstone National Park to the south, Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness to the east and south on the Custer and Shoshone National Forests, and Lee Metcalf Wilderness to the west on the Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest. At the far north end of the Gallatin Forest, there is a gap in high quality wolverine habitat, with a large stretch of valley bottom land between the Bridger and Crazy mountain ranges and the Belt mountain ranges to the north. This land is important for wolverine dispersal, but does not contain the high elevation, remote areas seemingly preferred by wolverines for permanent occupation and for reproductive habitat. We feel that snowmobile use restrictions provide some measure of winter habitat security for wolverines. However, state-regulated

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						wolverine harvest is not prohibited anywhere within the Gallatin National Forest, and is also allowed on adjacent lands in Montana. Wolverine trapping is prohibited on adjacent lands in Wyoming.
John Criger		107	Lakewood, CO	There is not any documentation to support that there are wolverines or Lynx populations in the Gallatin National Forest either inside or outside of the wilderness study areas.	Issues	There is documented occurrence of both wolverines and lynx on the Gallatin National Forest, both within Wilderness Study Areas (wolverine) and outside of WSA (both wolverine and lynx). Presence of these species has been documented through state trapping records; survey efforts using snow tracking, remote camera stations, and/or hair-snaring stations for DNA sampling; and an ongoing wolverine research project where multiple animals have been captured, fitted with tracking devices, released and monitored. Reproduction has been recently documented for wolverine on the Gallatin Forest. Although reproduction has not been recently documented for lynx in this area, suitable reproductive habitat exists.
John Criger		107	Lakewood, CO	Wolverine: Not endangered, Montana still allows trapping of same, so why worry about the necessary winter habitat and den sites.	Issues	The wolverine has been petitioned twice for listing under the Endangered Species Act and both times the US Fish and Wildlife Service has determined that there is insufficient data on wolverine population trends to warrant listing. Wolverines are classified as a Forest Service sensitive species, which are those species identified by the Regional Forester for which population viability is a concern. Both the Montana Natural Heritage Program and the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks department have identified the wolverine as a "species of concern". The Gallatin Forest Plan contains a forest-wide standard that "habitat essential to species identified in the Northern Region Sensitive Species list will be managed to maintain those species" (p. II-18). Wintering habitat is essential for wolverines. Human access to winter wolverine habitat is considered to have the greatest potential for adverse impacts on wolverines, since environmental conditions are more extreme, food sources can be limited, and energy demands are highest during this time. The trapping season for wolverines occurs during winter; therefore winter access has the most potential to contribute to direct mortalities of wolverines. Winter access into female wolverine denning habitat is considered to have the greatest potential for travel management decisions to influence

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						wolverine reproductive rates.
Kristen Walser		1049	Bozeman	the noise and activity of snowmobiles and ATVs affect grizzly and elk populations. Flora is destroyed and ruts create run off muddying creeks for native fish. The greatest damage occurs in spring and fall when there is not enough snow or dry ground to support off-road vehicles. Noxious weed seeds are carried by ATVs further into the forest, since they go further than nonmotorized users. Please designate Leverich, middle Cottonwood, Truman, Corbly Gulch, Gallatin Crest, Emerald, and Hyalite Lakes trails, and the Lionhead recommended wilderness has nonmotorized.	Motorized (General)	While the commenter makes a good point about impacts associated with motorized travel, it should be noted that non-motorized uses can also have adverse impacts on wildlife, damage vegetation, create ruts that contribute sedimentation through runoff, and spread noxious weeds. This Travel Plan attempts to provide a balanced spectrum of recreation opportunities for all forest users, while taking reasonable measure to protect natural resources. Alternative 7M would have Leverich managed for non-motorized use. Middle Cottonwood, Truman and Corbly would be open to motorized use (motorcycle only). The Gallatin Crest trail would be open to motorcycles (but not ATVs) from Hyalite to Windy Pass for a very short season (July 16 through September 4), and managed for non-motorized use south of Windy Pass to Onion Basin. Emerald and Hyalite Lake trails would be shared use trails under a staggered system where motorcycles (not ATVs) would be allowed only on certain days; however, the exact schedule has yet to be determined. The Lionhead Recommended Wilderness would be predominantly non-motorized under Alternative 7M. Please refer to the ROD for the final decision regarding the Lionhead TPA.
Keith Allen		1770		There seems to be an inherent assumption in the DEIS that motorized uses are more damaging to ungulate and predator populations has non-motorized uses. I do not believe this has been conclusively proven. In fact a Wyoming study indicated that hiking with a dog is more stressful to elk than motorized uses because elk cannot distinguish between a dog and a wolf and because a hiker is in the same relative area for a longer time. Conversely, off-highway motorcycle use patterns are such that the distress quickly dissipates because the vehicle is so rapidly (relative to hiking) in an doubt of the animals' immediate area.	Motorized (General)	It is recognized that non-motorized use can affect wildlife, and in some cases as cited by the commenter, can be even more disruptive to wildlife than some types of motorized use. However, the vast majority of research and literature regarding the effects of human use on wildlife supports the conclusion that motorized use has greater impacts because of the distance that noise can travel, and because motorized users can travel further, faster and thereby have disturbance impacts over a much greater area and thus affect a larger number of individual animals. Further, motorized users often stop their vehicles and get off, thereby contributing non-motorized disturbance effects as well.
Tom Reed Jim Posewitz Mike Beagle	Backcountry Hunters and Anglers	490	Bozeman Helena Eagle Point, OR	Finally, we are concerned about conflicts between mountain goats and snowmobiles. New, powerful snow machines can reach remote areas where mountain goats found security in years past. We ask land managers take this into account in managing	Non-motorized (General)	Disturbance of mountain goats was a major factor considered in the snowmobile use configuration for the Bridger and Gallatin ranges. Under Alternative 7M, winter area closures were imposed that considerably reduced the amount of terrain open to dispersed

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				winter access in the Gallatin and Bridger ranges. Snowmobile use should be managed to avoid stress to winter wildlife.		snowmobile use compared to current conditions. Snowmobile access to the Bridger ridge, which provides key wintering habitat for goats, would be allowed in only a few locations between Ross Peak and Hardscrabble Peak. Snowmobile area closures would be imposed on the west side of the Bridgers at high elevation sites important to goats. For the Gallatin Range, much of the winter habitat used by mountain goats would be closed to dispersed snowmobile use, with the exception of Emerald Lake Basin, and the Crest area from Sentinel Peak through Windy Pass to Eaglehead Mountain.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	AWL believes that it is essential for the west side of the Bridgers to remain motor-free to facilitate wildlife movement. The cumulative effects of the Bridger Bowl expansion, private land development, land exchanges and the travel plan make a non-motorized west side of the Bridgers biologically essential. This TPA should include a Migration Corridor goal similar to the Lionhead's which provides for wildlife connectivity between the Bridgers and Big Belts.	North Bridgers	Although it is generally recognized that lower motorized use levels better facilitate wildlife movement, there is no evidence that all motorized use on backcountry roads and trails is incompatible with wildlife movement. Backcountry roads do not pose barriers to wildlife movement like wider, paved, high-speed/volume roads do. Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles only (no ATVs) on Middle Cottonwood (#586), Truman Gulch (#535) and Corbly Gulch (#544), along with the segment of the Bridger Foothills Trail (#534) that connects them. A seasonal motorized use restriction from April 1 through June 15 would add habitat security during the spring migration season for most wildlife. Spring is a key timeframe for wildlife movement in the Bridgers when ungulate species are moving from wintering grounds to calving/fawning areas and into summer range. Motorcycle trails in this area present a level of technical difficulty that appeals primarily to the most experienced riders. At the north end of the west Bridgers, the Johnson Canyon area would provide motorized recreation opportunities for ATVs and high clearance passenger vehicles as well as motorcycles. Here again, seasonal motorized use restrictions would add habitat security during the spring migration season (through June 15.) The North Bridgers area is recognized as an important wildlife corridor that provides habitat connectivity between the Bridger and Belt ranges (DEIS, Vol. 2, Chapter 3-63). However, since wildlife migration/movement corridors are important across the entire forest, and these corridors have not all been formally identified, the goal for maintaining these important habitat components has been made a Forest-

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						wide goal (Goal F) in the FEIS. This allows us to continue to identify important wildlife corridors for future protection and enhancement. The Lionhead, Bozeman Pass and North Bridgers wildlife corridors have been identified and analyzed in the FEIS.
Paul Griffin	Gallatin Wildlife Association	707		GWA agree with restrictions for ATVs and motorcycles in alternatives 4, 5, 6, 7 for trails #522 and 523. This is relatively open country similar to that found in the Gravelly Range. These restrictions would enhance elk security.	North Bridgers	Trails #522 and 523 in the North Bridger Range would continue with non-motorized use designation under Alternative 7M.
Russ Ehnes	MTVRA	837		An example of why Alternative 7 is unsupportable is that in the Bridgers areas have been left open in where elk actually winter. The motorized community recognizes this could create a "wildlife conflict", resulting in another area "closure" for snowmobiles in the future.	West Bridger North Travel Planning Area	There is no quality elk winter range on public lands in the Bridger Mountains. Mule deer winter range is of concern on the west side of the Bridger Range. Alternative 7M would have the west side managed primarily for non-motorized use, except in the Johnson Canyon area, where wintering wildlife issues are not as critical as elsewhere in the range. Area closures for dispersed snowmobile use would be imposed on the west side, but only in areas where snowmobile access could easily be gained from either Johnson Canyon, or from over the top where snowmobile use would be permitted on the east side. Area closures were not included at lower elevations on the west side, since these areas are not typically conducive to snowmobiling. Dispersed snowmobile use would continue on the east side of the Bridger Range, but with more area closures than are present today. We recognize that this use could result in conflicts with wintering wildlife (primarily mountain goats and wolverines); however, we felt that some snowmobile use in the highly popular Fairy Lake area provides a valuable recreation opportunity.
Noreen Breeding		1004	Bozeman	Lower Corbly Gulch has been so abused by ATVs and 4x4s. A lot of the 4x4 damage appears to happen during hunting season. Motorized traffic on this trail is inappropriate b/c of several stream crossings and b/c it terminates at a junction w/ non-motorized trail #534 coming up from Fairy Lake. This is also mtn goat territory where goats are best left undisturbed by motor vehicles.	West Bridgers North	The lower portion of Corbly Gulch (e.g. the road up to the Trailhead) is a county road, which is beyond the jurisdiction of the Forest Travel Plan. Once inside the Forest boundary, Alternative 7M would manage the Corbly Gulch (AKA Limestone) Trail #544 as open to motorized use by motorcycle only (no 4-wheeled vehicles). This change was implemented partly in response to ongoing resource damage in the area, and partly due to potential conflicts with wildlife and with non-motorized users. The designated route for motorcycle use would connect with trail #534 (Bridger foothills trail) on the west side of the range, but trail #534 over the top

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						near Sacagawea Peak to Fairy Lake would remain open for non-motorized use only. We recognize that the upper part of the Corbly trail and much of the Bridger foothills trail cross through mountain goat habitat and that there could be disturbance effects to goats from motorized use of this trail system. However, trails in this area present a level of technical difficulty that appeals primarily to the most experienced riders. We believe motorized use on these challenging routes would be low compared with easier trails, which would help limit the potential disturbance effects to mountain goats and other wildlife.
Anne Banks	BWAGS	1177	Bozeman	The West Bridgers as a whole are not desirable for either snowmobiling or cross country skiing because of lack of snow cover at lower elevations and steep hard to access terrain higher up. Closing the range south of Ross Pass to snowmobiles is a good decision; closing the area north of Ross Pass is equally desirable. These closures would protect mule deer winter range and mountain goat, lynx, and wolverine habitat at higher elevations.	West Bridgers North	We agree with the commenter that the west side of the Bridger Range is generally not conducive to winter recreation due to lack of snow cover. Mule deer winter range occurs at lower elevations on the west side, where snowmobile use is typically not feasible and therefore not a concern. While we recognize that snowmobile area closures at high elevations north of Ross Pass would help protect wintering habitat for mountain goat, wolverine and lynx, we felt that this area provides an important winter recreation opportunity that is not available elsewhere in close proximity to Bozeman. Therefore, as a compromise, some limited areas on the east side of the range below Ross Peak and around Fairy Lake basin were left open for dispersed snowmobile use under Alternative 7M. To balance this use, snowmobile area closures were imposed at high elevations on the west side to provide some additional habitat security for wintering wildlife.
David Gaillard		303		snowmobiles should be prohibited from the following pristine areas that are critical areas for wildlife year-round the northwestern Bridgers (this areas terrain makes it unsuitable for snowmobiles anyway, yet it provides important habitat for wolverines and other wildlife throughout the winter and spring).	West Bridgers North	Under Alternative 7M, the only area in the northwest part of the Bridger Range that would be managed to allow for dispersed snowmobile use is in the Johnson Canyon area. This area is roaded as a result of past timber harvest and has traditionally provided a desirable winter recreation experience for snowmobile riding. Area closures at higher elevations in the northwest part of the Bridgers would prohibit snowmobile use in the upper North Cottonwood drainage to Corbly Gulch. These areas contain valuable winter wildlife habitat, which could potentially be reached by snowmobile from either Johnson Canyon on the west side, or from over the top where snowmobile use would be allowed on the east

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						side. Other important winter wildlife habitat on the west side of the range was not included in snowmobile area closures, because these areas are generally not accessible by snowmobile due to lack of snow cover at lower elevations.
Jenny McCune	Gallatin Valley Bicycle Club	762		I urge the Forest Service to keep the area between Ross Pass and Hardscrabble Peak (on the Westside) snowmobile free in order to protect wolverine habitat.	West Bridgers North	Alternative 7M would impose snowmobile area closures at higher elevations from North Cottonwood Creek to Corbly Gulch. These areas contain valuable winter habitat for wolverines and other species, which could potentially be reached by snowmobile from either Johnson Canyon on the west side, or from over the top where snowmobile use would be allowed on the east side. Other important winter wildlife habitat on the west side of the range was not included in snowmobile area closures, because these areas are generally not accessible by snowmobile due to lack of snow cover at lower elevations.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Snowmobile Use in the Bridger Range: we recommend the "Area Close to Snowmobile except on Designated Route's" designation be extended along the crest of the Bridger Mountains. The reason is to avoid unwanted negative impacts on wintering mountain goats.	West Bridgers North	This comment was from the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP) office in Bozeman. In subsequent discussions and correspondence with FWP staff, we received additional input that modified the configuration of open and closed snowmobile area near the Bridger Mountain crest. (FWP letter to Forest Supervisor, 9/15/05).
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	1441		Potential bighorn sheep habitat is present in Johnson Canyon and other parts of the West Bridgers. As potential which complex with objective 1(2) to provide an additional motorized loop, Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks considers the area as priority wild sheep habitats and has plans for future transplants. We cannot support motorized use of trails 528, 545, 544, and 534 for the same reason: bighorn sheep security.	West Bridgers North	We agree that the Bridger Range provides suitable bighorn sheep habitat. However, we do not feel that the motorized loop facility provided for under Alternative 7M would compromise the ability of sheep to prosper in the Bridger Mountains. The Johnson Canyon area has been primarily managed for timber production in recent years. As a result, it is in various stages of forest succession, and does not contain high quality bighorn sheep habitat in the roaded areas. The proposed motorized recreation loop would mainly be located on existing roads. The short segment of connecter trail needed to complete the loop would involve new construction; therefore, this project would require a separate NEPA analysis prior to trail construction. Under Alternative 7M, motorized use would be allowed on trail #528 between Johnson Canyon and Felix roads, but the majority of this trail North of Felix Canyon would be non-motorized. Trail #545 up North Cottonwood Creek would be non-motorized as well. Trail #544 up Corbly Gulch would be

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						open to use by motorcycles (not ATVs) as would trail #534, the Bridger Foothills trail, between Corbly Gulch and Middle Cottonwood Creek. Although portions of the trail system open to motorized use would pass through high quality sheep habitat, these trails present a level of technical difficulty that appeals primarily to the most experienced riders. We believe that motorized use on these challenging routes would be low compared with easier trails, which would help limit the potential disturbance effects to bighorn sheep and other wildlife.
Chris Naumann		1454		The entire western slope of the Bridgers should be closed to snowmobiles as it is wintering grounds for mule deer and elk.	West Bridgers North	The lower slopes on the west side of the Bridger Range provide quality winter range, primarily for mule deer. Winter range in this area does not hold sufficient snow to provide snowmobile opportunities. We saw no need to impose snowmobile area closures in places where snow cover is lacking. The only area on the west side of the Bridger Range that is conducive to snowmobile riding is Johnson Canyon at the far north end. This area tends to hold snow better, and has a road system that provides family type snowmobile opportunities. Although there is some important mule deer winter range in the vicinity of Johnson Canyon, the primary road system where most snowmobile use takes place is not within key winter range habitat.
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	619a		Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks considers the areas as priority wild sheep habitats and has plans for future transplants. We cannot support motorized use of trails 528, 545, 544, and 534 for the same reasons: Bighorn sheep security.	West Bridgers North	We agree that the Bridger Range provides suitable bighorn sheep habitat. However, we do not feel that the motorized loop facility provided for under Alternative 7M would compromise the ability of sheep to prosper in the Bridger Mountains. The Johnson Canyon area has been primarily managed for timber production in recent years. As a result, it is in various stages of forest succession, and does not contain high quality bighorn sheep habitat in the roaded areas. The proposed motorized recreation loop would mainly be located on existing roads. The short segment of connecter trail needed to complete the loop would involve new construction; therefore, this project would require a separate NEPA analysis prior to trail construction. Under Alternative 7M, motorized use would be allowed on trail #528 between Johnson Canyon and Felix roads, but the majority of this trail North of Felix Canyon would be non-motorized. Trail #545 up North Cottonwood Creek would be non-motorized as well. Trail #544 up Corbly Gulch would be

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						open to use by motorcycles (not ATVs) as would trail #534, the Bridger Foothills trail, between Corbly Gulch and Middle Cottonwood Creek. Although portions of the trail system open to motorized use would pass through high quality sheep habitat, these trails present a level of technical difficulty that appeals primarily to the most experienced riders. We believe that motorized use on these challenging routes would be low compared with easier trails, which would help limit the potential disturbance effects to bighorn sheep and other wildlife.
Paul Griffin	Gallatin Wildlife Association	707		GWA does not support objective 1(2) to provide an additional motorized loop in Johnson Canyon. This is potential bighorn sheep habitat when bighorns are released in the Bridgers. GWA does not support motorized use of trails 528, 545, 544, 534 for the same reasons, bighorn sheep security when bighorn sheep are transplanted to the area. Bluegrounse security from "cruise n' shoot" harvesting is an additional reason to restrict motorized access.	West Bridgers North	We agree that the Bridger Range provides suitable bighorn sheep habitat. However, we do not feel that the motorized loop facility presented under Alternative 7M would compromise the ability of sheep to prosper in the Bridger Mountains. The Johnson Canyon area has been primarily managed for timber production in recent years. As a result, it is in various stages of forest succession, and does not contain high quality bighorn sheep habitat in the roaded areas. The proposed motorized recreation loop would mainly be located on existing roads. The short segment of connecter trail needed to complete the loop would involve new construction; therefore, this project would require a separate NEPA analysis prior to trail construction. Under Alternative 7M, motorized use would be allowed on trail #528 between Johnson Canyon and Felix roads, but the majority of this trail North of Felix Canyon would be non-motorized. Trail #545 up North Cottonwood Creek would be non-motorized as well. Trail #544 up Corbly Gulch would be open to use by motorcycles (not ATVs) as would trail #534, the Bridger Foothills trail, between Corbly Gulch and Middle Cottonwood Creek. Although portions of the trail system open to motorized use would pass through high quality sheep habitat, these trails present a level of technical difficulty that appeals primarily to the most experienced riders. We believe that motorized use on these challenging routes would be low compared with easier trails, which would help limit the potential disturbance effects to bighorn sheep and other wildlife.
David Gaillard		303		Snowmobiles should be prohibited from the following pristine areas that are critical areas for wildlife year-round: The northwestern Bridgers (this area's terrain makes it unsuitable for snowmobiles anyway, yet it	West Bridgers North	As the commenter notes, the west side of the Bridger Range is terrain limited for snowmobiles, and lack of snow cover on this side of the range makes most of the area unsuitable for snowmobile use. We saw no need to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				provides important habitat for wolverines and other wildlife throughout the winter and spring).		impose area closures in places where snowmobile use is not likely to occur. The only area on the west side of the Bridger Range that is conducive to snowmobile riding is Johnson Canyon at the far north end. This area tends to hold snow better, and has a road system that provides family type snowmobile opportunities. Alternative 7M would impose snowmobile area closures on the west side of the Bridger Range at upper elevations from North Cottonwood Creek south to just past Sacagawea Peak. These were the places on the west side that were determined to be accessible by snowmobile from open areas on the east side, or from Johnson Canyon. These area closures would provide habitat security in important wintering areas for wolverines and other wildlife.
		188		In the winter, the West side of the bridges should not be open to snowmobiles. This area is the only secure habitat available in the Bridger's for wildlife and that should not be compromised,	West Bridgers North	For the most part, the west side of the Bridger Range does not provide suitable terrain for snowmobile use. Lack of snow and terrain limitations discourage snowmobile use, and we saw no need to impose area closures in places where snowmobile use is not likely to occur. The only area on the west side of the Bridger Range that is conducive to snowmobile riding is Johnson Canyon at the far north end. This area tends to hold snow better, and has a road system that provides family type snowmobile opportunities. Alternative 7M would impose snowmobile area closures on the west side of the Bridger Range at upper elevations from North Cottonwood Creek south to just past Sacagawea Peak. These were the places on the west side that were determined to be accessible by snowmobile from open areas on the east side, or from Johnson Canyon. These area closures would provide habitat security in important wintering areas for wolverines and other wildlife.
Linn Barrett		258	Greely, CO	I also feel that motorized traffic does not belong on the west sedie of the Bridger Mountain Range. To protect dwindling numbers of wolverine, the Forest Service should make the roadless heart of the Bridgers off limit to motorized traffic	West Bridgers South	There are currently no statistically reliable population trend data for wolverines in southwest Montana or the Bridger Mountains, so there is no indication that wolverine numbers are dwindling in the Bridgers or elsewhere. However, the wolverine is classified as a Forest Service sensitive species, for which population viability is a concern. The commenter does not specifically identify the area they refer to as "the roadless heart of the Bridgers". Under Alternative 7M, there would be large blocks of land, particularly on the west side of the range, that contain no summer

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						motorized designated routes. Winter motorized use would also be more limited under Alternative 7M than currently, through the use of snowmobile area restrictions. Winter use restrictions would occur primarily on the east side of the Bridger range, but with some area restrictions at higher elevations on the west side as well. The lower elevation terrain on the west side of the range does not typically hold snow, so it is not suitable for snowmobile use.
Martin Steitz		268	Forest Lake, MN	I also feel that motorized traffic does not belong on the west sedie of the Bridger Mountain Range. To protect dwindling numbers of wolverine, the Forest Service should make the roadless heart of the Bridgers off limit to motorized traffic. Snowmobile use is already occurring and can be defined by easily enforceable boundaries.	West Bridgers South	There are currently no statistically reliable population trend data for wolverines in southwest Montana or the Bridger Mountains, so there is no indication that wolverine numbers are dwindling in the Bridgers or elsewhere. However, the wolverine is classified as a Forest Service sensitive species, for which population viability is a concern. The commenter does not specifically identify the area they refer to as "the roadless heart of the Bridgers". Under Alternative 7M, there would be large blocks of land, particularly on the west side of the range, that contain no summer motorized designated routes. Winter motorized use would also be more limited under Alternative 7M than currently, through the use of snowmobile area restrictions. Winter use restrictions would occur primarily on the east side of the Bridger range, but with some area restrictions at higher elevations on the west side as well. The lower elevation terrain on the west side of the range does not typically hold snow, so it is not suitable for snowmobile use.
Jim Barrett		881		To protect dwindling numbers of wolverine the heart of the Bridgers should be off limits to motorized traffic	West Bridgers South	There are currently no statistically reliable population trend data for wolverines in southwest Montana or the Bridger Mountains, so there is no indication that wolverine numbers are dwindling in the Bridgers or elsewhere. However, the wolverine is classified as a Forest Service sensitive species, for which population viability is a concern. Under Alternative 7M, there would be large blocks of land, particularly on the west side of the range, that contain no summer motorized designated routes. Winter motorized use would also be more limited under Alternative 7M than currently, through the use of snowmobile area restrictions. Winter use restrictions would occur primarily on the east side of the Bridger range, but with some area restrictions at higher

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						elevations on the west side as well. The lower elevation terrain on the west side of the range does not typically hold snow, so it is not suitable for snowmobile use.
Rene Colucci		898	New York	Truman Gulch, Corbly Gulch, N Cottonwood, the M trail should be off limits to ORV use b/c there is heavy wolverine denning areas.	West Bridgers South	The wolverine reproductive denning season occurs during winter. Under Alternative 7M, the potential denning habitat in North Cottonwood Creek and Corbly Gulch would be within a snowmobile area closure. Snowmobile use in Truman Gulch is currently limited by poor access and difficult terrain. The M Trail does not appear to provide suitable wolverine denning habitat; however this area would also be within a snowmobile area closure, for purposes of providing a quality non-motorized winter recreation experience.
Charlie Crangle		902	Bozeman	Motorized traffic does not belong on the west side of the Bridgers to protect the wolverine.	West Bridgers South	There are currently no statistically reliable population trend data for wolverines in southwest Montana or the Bridger Mountains, so there is no indication that wolverine numbers are dwindling in the Bridgers or elsewhere. However, the wolverine is classified as a Forest Service sensitive species, for which population viability is a concern. Under Alternative 7M, there would be large blocks of land, particularly on the west side of the range, that contain no summer motorized designated routes. Winter motorized use would also be more limited under Alternative 7M than currently, through the use of snowmobile area restrictions. Winter use restrictions would occur primarily on the east side of the Bridger range, but with some area restrictions at higher elevations on the west side as well. The lower elevation terrain on the west side of the range does not typically hold snow, so it is not suitable for snowmobile use.
Bob Ebinger/ Robin Hoggan Ebinger		906	Livingston	Motorized traffic does not belong on the west side of the Bridgers to protect the wolverine.	West Bridgers South	There are currently no statistically reliable population trend data for wolverines in southwest Montana or the Bridger Mountains, so there is no indication that wolverine numbers are dwindling in the Bridgers or elsewhere. However, the wolverine is classified as a Forest Service sensitive species, for which population viability is a concern. Under Alternative 7M, there would be large blocks of land, particularly on the west side of the range, that contain no summer motorized designated routes. Winter motorized use would also be more limited under Alternative 7M than currently, through the use of snowmobile area restrictions. Winter use restrictions would occur primarily on the east side of the Bridger

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						range, but with some area restrictions at higher elevations on the west side as well. The lower elevation terrain on the west side of the range does not typically hold snow, so it is not suitable for snowmobile use.
Joan Bailey		1000	Portland OR	Motorized traffic does not belong on the west side of the Bridgers to protect the dwindling number of wolverine.	West Bridgers South	There are currently no statistically reliable population trend data for wolverines in southwest Montana or the Bridger Mountains, so there is no indication that wolverine numbers are dwindling in the Bridgers or elsewhere. However, the wolverine is classified as a Forest Service sensitive species, for which population viability is a concern. Under Alternative 7M, there would be large blocks of land, particularly on the west side of the range, that contain no summer motorized designated routes. Winter motorized use would also be more limited under Alternative 7M than currently, through the use of snowmobile area restrictions. Winter use restrictions would occur primarily on the east side of the Bridger range, but with some area restrictions at higher elevations on the west side as well. The lower elevation terrain on the west side of the range does not typically hold snow, so it is not suitable for snowmobile use.
Nikki Fink		1011		Motorized traffic does not belong on the west side of the Bridgers to protect the dwindling number of wolverine.	West Bridgers South	There are currently no statistically reliable population trend data for wolverines in southwest Montana or the Bridger Mountains, so there is no indication that wolverine numbers are dwindling in the Bridgers or elsewhere. However, the wolverine is classified as a Forest Service sensitive species, for which population viability is a concern. Under Alternative 7M, there would be large blocks of land, particularly on the west side of the range, that contain no summer motorized designated routes. Winter motorized use would also be more limited under Alternative 7M than currently, through the use of snowmobile area restrictions. Winter use restrictions would occur primarily on the east side of the Bridger range, but with some area restrictions at higher elevations on the west side as well. The lower elevation terrain on the west side of the range does not typically hold snow, so it is not suitable for snowmobile use.
Catherine Weeden		1604		More importantly than the recreation issues, designating the west side motor-free will save a contiguous block of land large enough to be meaningful for native plant and animal habitat year round into the next 15 years. This would not only	West Bridgers South	Under Alternative 7M, motorized use on the west side of the Bridger Range would be more limited than it is currently. This alternative would allow motorcycles only (no ATVs) on Middle Cottonwood (#586), Truman Gulch (#535) and Corbly Gulch (#544), along with the segment

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				help prevent the spread of weeds by off road vehicles, but would reduce hunting stress on the wildlife.		of the Bridger Foothills Trail (#534) that connects them. Motorcycle trails in this area present a level of technical difficulty that appeals primarily to the most experienced riders. At the north end of the west Bridgers, the Johnson Canyon area would provide motorized recreation opportunities for ATVs and high clearance passenger vehicles as well as motorcycles. Restricting all summer motorized use to designated routes, and reducing the miles of route open to motorized use is expected to have beneficial effects in terms of controlling the spread of noxious weeds. Hunting pressure is not considered a problem on the west side of the Bridger Range. In fact, elk numbers are currently far above population objectives in the Bridger Range, and Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks department is considering revising hunting regulations to increase the number of elk harvested in this area.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Within the Bridgers - Bangtails, summer elk habitat on the east side is heavily fragmented with road densities ranging as high as 8.6 mi/mi2 for total routes and 8.3 mi/mi2 for open routes. The best opportunity for protecting elk habitat in the Bridgers is on the west side of the crest. Prohibition of motorcycle use on Middle Cottonwood Trail #586, Truman Gulch Trail #535, the entirety of the Bridger Foothills Trail #534, Corbly Gulch Trail #544, Fairy Lake Trail #500, Honeymoon Trail #525 as well as dropping the proposal to create Johnson Canyon Trail Connect would allow unfragmented summer elk habitat the west side of the crest. Same for mule deer, bighorn sheep, and grizzly bears.	West Bridgers South	It is difficult to discern how the commenter obtained the figures for road densities. However, these figures clearly are not reflective of the entire east side of the Bridger Range and the Bangtails. The primary contribution to high road densities in the Bridger/Bangtail ranges comes from private roads, over which this Travel Plan has no jurisdiction. Nevertheless, the fact remains that these areas do have relatively high motorized route densities, which can have adverse impacts to wildlife. Alternative 7M would effectively reduce motorized route densities in the west Bridgers compared with existing conditions. Elk numbers are currently far above population objectives in the Bridger Range, and Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks department is considering revising hunting regulations to increase the number of elk harvested in this area.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		We encourage the Gallatin to adopt the more protective snowmobile standards from Alt 7. On the west side of the Bridgers, which is critical wolverine habitat, and highly prized as a non-motorized backcountry ski location, snowmobiles should be restricted completely, or only permitted in already established play areas.	West Bridgers South	For the most part, the west side of the Bridger Range does not provide suitable terrain for snowmobile use. Lack of snow and terrain limitations discourage snowmobile use, and we saw no need to impose area closures in places where snowmobile use is not likely to occur. The Johnson Canyon area receives the majority of established snowmobile use in the west Bridgers and would remain open to such use under Alternative 7M. This alternative would impose snowmobile area closures on the west side of the Bridger Range at upper

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						elevations from North Cottonwood Creek south to just past Sacagawea Peak. These were the places on the west side that were determined to be accessible by snowmobile from open areas on the east side, or from Johnson Canyon. These area closures would provide habitat security in important wintering areas for wolverines and other wildlife.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		In addition to issues of user conflicts, the west side of the Bridgers is also home to denning wolverine and is important habitat for ungulates, especially mule deer, throughout the year. Snow along the west side of these mountains is seldom good enough for snowmobiling and attempts to use the em in this area will only resulting damage to the soils, vegetation, wildlife and water quality.	West Bridgers South	The west side of the Bridger range is recognized as important habitat for wolverines, ungulates and other wildlife. Under Alternative 7M, the primary snowmobile use area on the west side of the Bridgers would continue to be in the Johnson Canyon area. This area holds snow better and the existing road system provides family type snowmobile riding opportunities. Alternative 7M would impose snowmobile area closures on the west side of the Bridger Range at upper elevations from North Cottonwood Creek south to just past Sacagawea Peak. These were the places on the west side that were determined to be accessible by snowmobile from open areas on the east side, or from Johnson Canyon. These area closures would provide habitat security in important wintering areas for wolverines and other wildlife.
Nike G. Stevens		1046	Bozeman	I want to have more nonmotorized opportunities near my home in the Bangtail and West Bridger areas. I want to see these areas continue to support the abundance and diverse wildlife populations including sensitive species such as Wolverine and moose that they now support.	West Bridgers South	Alternative 7M would restrict all summer motorized use to designated routes, which would effectively reduce overall motorized use in the Bangtails and west Bridgers. The change in travel plan philosophy to better manage OHV (motorcycle, ATV, 4X4, and snowmobile) use will have a positive influence on managing for sustainable populations of wolverine, moose and other species.
Laura Oliver		480	Bozeman	Bridgers: Motorized traffic does not belong on the west side of the Bridger Mountain Range. To protect dwindling numbers of wolverine, the Forest Service should make the roadless heart of the Bridgers off limits to motorized traffic.	West Bridgers South	There are currently no statistically reliable population trend data for wolverines in southwest Montana or the Bridger Mountains, so there is no indication that wolverine numbers are dwindling in the Bridgers or elsewhere. However, the wolverine is classified as a Forest Service sensitive species, for which population viability is a concern. Under Alternative 7M, there would be large blocks of land, particularly on the west side of the range, that contain no summer motorized designated routes. Winter motorized use would also be more limited under Alternative 7M than currently, through the use of snowmobile area restrictions. Winter use restrictions would occur primarily on the east side of the Bridger range, but with some area restrictions at higher

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						elevations on the west side as well. The lower elevation terrain on the west side of the range does not typically hold snow, so it is not suitable for snowmobile use.
Charles M. Howe	Ross Peak Ranch	655	Belgrade	The maximum width of the Bridger Mountains at the center of the proposed "Motorized use area" is only 3.35 miles wide. It has been stated at public meetings that motorized recreationalists need 10 to 40 miles of trail to enjoy a half day recreation experience. That amount of use in the narrowest portion of the Bridgers will have the effect of severing the migration route of every mammal that uses the cover of the Bridgers as a migration route from north to south. Without motorized interference this part of the range serves as calving grounds to all of the ruminant species and predatory species as well.	West Bridgers South	Although it is generally recognized that lower motorized use levels better facilitate wildlife movement, there is no evidence that all motorized use on backcountry roads and trails is incompatible with wildlife movement. Backcountry roads do not pose barriers to wildlife movement like wider, paved, high-speed/volume roads do. Alternative 7M would restrict all summer motorized use to designated routes, which would effectively reduce overall motorized use levels in the Bridger Range. Under this alternative, the vast majority of backcountry roads and trails open to motorized use would have seasonal restrictions that prohibit motorized use until June 15. Spring is a key timeframe for wildlife movement in the Bridgers when ungulate species are moving from wintering grounds to calving/fawning areas and into summer range. Most designated motorized routes in key linkage areas would also have fall time restrictions on motorized use, which would add habitat security during important wildlife migration periods. Only the major access roads (e.g. to Bridger Bowl and other private land) have year-round access for motorized vehicles.
Joe Lawellin		13		Access to FS land should be part of every land swap made so that we, the public, can reach the areas without crossing the private landowner. The access should be from drainage to drainage.	Access	The proposed Travel Management Plan, Alternatives 2 through 7-M, include programmatic direction to acquire public and administrative access to Gallatin National Forest land where inadequate access currently exists (Refer to Chapter I of the Detailed Description of Alternatives). In addition, it is Forest Service policy to carefully consider the need to protect and enhance public and administrative access in all land exchange proposals.
Loren Blanksma		1194		There is a sign on the Main Boulder highway on private land at the entrance to Cherry Creek road that indicates that access will be closed in 2010. I think that prescriptive easement rights for this access have been well established by now and hope the FS will fight to keep this as a permanent public access.	Deer Creeks	This comment refers to the Cherry Creek Road, located south of Big Timber in the Boulder River drainage. The Cherry Creek Road has historically provided public and administrative access to the National Forest System (NFS) lands in this area. In 1999, the Public Lands Access Association, Inc.(PLAAI) filed a lawsuit against the involved landowners, seeking to re-open the road, which had been closed to public use. Subsequently, PLAAI and the landowners reached a settlement to the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						lawsuit, in which the parties agreed that Cherry Creek Road would remain open to vehicle use for a period of ten years, ie through 2009. The Forest Service was not a party to this agreement between PLAAI and the landowners. The Forest Service fully recognizes the need to provide and maintain permanent public and administrative access to the NFS lands in the Cherry Creek area.
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	619a		Access to public lands is important but it should not degrade habitat, adversely affect wildlife and wildlife habitat, or diminish "fair chase" hunting. The "Description of Access Needs" section for the GNF as detailed in I-6, 11 is not necessarily complete or accurate and needs to be corrected.	Goals and Objectives	This comment refers to the Forest-wide Goals and Objectives in Chapter I regarding "Access". In the July 21, 2005 letter from Montana Wildlife Federation (Larry Copenhaver, Conservation Director), MWF offers comments in support of the need to provide and maintain reasonable access across non-federal lands to NFS lands. MWF makes a distinction that providing access to the NFS lands is different from managing travel through and across NFS lands. The Forest Service fully recognizes and agrees with this distinction. The primary purpose of the travel plan is to manage public travel through and across NFS lands. MWF also comments that Table I-3 "Description of Access Needs" is "...not necessarily complete or accurate and needs to be corrected." However, MWF does not offer any specific corrections to Table I-3. In response to that last comment, the Forest Service would like to receive and consider any specific suggested changes or corrections to Table I-3, now or in the future.
David Molebash	Montana Ranch Company	677		Private lands within the Hyalite/Porcupine WSA. Montana Ranch Company owns 3 sections within the boundary and desires to build a road into two of them to manage our property for fire prevention and stock use. The proposed travel plan will only make it more difficult to cut through the red tape that already exists to accomplish this. Over the last decade we have tried to exchange these sections with the Gallatin NF on 3 separate occasions but have not been able to reach an agreement acceptable to both parties. My concern is that because we have allowed this much time for the Gallatin to review exchange proposals, that now the door will shut on being able to manage our own lands.	General	This comment is outside the scope of the travel plan decisions. The comment refers to three sections of private land (sections 5, 7 and 9), owned by Montana Ranch Company (MRC), located in the upper Pole Gulch - Fridley Creek area, within the boundary of the Gallatin (HPBH) Wilderness Study Area. Travel Plan decisions will NOT affect access to, or management of, these MRC lands, or other private inholdings. In addition, in response to this comment, the Forest Service remains interested in acquiring these MRC lands by exchange or purchase, and discussions with MRC are ongoing at this time.
Paige Dringman		1008	Big Timber	The stated access objectives as they pertain to the Sweet Grass drainage in the Crazies are both	East Crazies	The Forest-wide Goals and Objectives address the need to secure adequate public and administrative access

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				unwarranted and inconsistent w/ legal conditions on the ground, and inconsistent w/ this very travel planning document. The FS does not have legal access and should be working w/ landowners on cooperative arrangements.		rights to all National Forest System lands. In response to this comment, the Travel Plan (Chapter I, Table I-3) identifies the need to secure public and administrative access rights to the Forest boundary, and across intermingled private lands in the Sweetgrass area, on the east side of the Crazy Mountains. The Forest Service recognizes that adequate legal access rights are lacking in the Sweetgrass area. The Forest Service seeks to cooperate with the involved landowners to address the mutual access needs in this area of the Forest.
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	619a		Additional Option #9) Consider adding the following Forest-wide goal, objectives and guidelines for providing and maintaining reasonable, legal access to National Forest System lands. Goal B: Access: Provide and maintain resonable, legal access to Gallatin National Forest lands to provide for human use and enjoyment and to protect and manage Forest resources and values. Objective B-1: Acquire, across non-National Forest System lands, perpetual road and trail easements needed to assure adequate protection, administration and management of National Forest resources and values. Objective B-2: Acquire all interests and rights needed to meet the objectives and future uses of the National Forest System.	Goals and Objectives	This comment refers to the Forest-wide Goals and Objectives in Chapter I regarding "Access". In the July 21, 2005 letter from Montana Wildlife Federation (Larry Copenhaver, Conservation Director), MWF first restates Goal B and Objectives B-1 and B-2, and then makes the following Comment: "MWF considers access to public lands and travel through the public land to be two separate issues entirely. Access to our public land can be difficult to find at times; MWF is currently in a 5-year campaign for Public Access to Public Lands and Public Wildlife to address this. Private interests often times will discourage public passage to the public land, then use that land for private purposes. MWF believes this is wrong and must be discouraged at all costs. Obtaining access across non-USFS lands to reach public lands is worthwhile to reduce this defacto privatization of public lands." Response: Overall, the Forest Service agrees with this comment. The Access goals and objectives (Goal B and Objectives B-1 to B-6) address the need to secure and maintain access rights to the NFS lands. The Access goals and objectives do not address travel through NFS lands. The travel plan itself addresses travel through NFS lands.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		We also believe Objective B-1 (page I-3) and Table I-3, Forest Access Objectives, should be reviewed to assure that provisions of access to roadless lands is limited to where such access is absolutely needed and justified. Specific areas where we believe roadless characteristics and the presence of sensitive resources particularly justify restrictions on motorized access to protect resources include: Lionhead, HPBH WSA, West side of the Bridger	Goals and Objectives	The Forest-wide Goals and Objectives in Chapter I regarding "Access" address the need to secure adequate public and administrative access rights to all National Forest System lands. Forest Service direction is to acquire and maintain permanent access rights (easements) needed to manage the NFS lands for multiple use purposes. EPA expresses concerns about maintaining roadless qualities, and restricting motorized access to protect resources, particularly in certain

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Mountain Range.		identified areas. The Forest Service shares these concerns. The Forest Service seeks to acquire and maintain legal rights of access to manage NFS lands. Then, through the travel plan, the Forest Service is making decisions that will restrict vehicle use of some roads and trails to maintain roadless qualities, to protect resources and to provide a variety of recreational experiences.
Dennis Tilton	Shooting Star Ranch	115		Regarding road on Sec 30, T8S R7E, this road is presently used only to by Shooting Star Ranch to access ranch properties in section 29 & 31 and is open for summer motorized use. This road provides the only legal motorized access to section 1. Alt 7 closes this road.	Yankee Jim Canyon	This comment from the manager of Shooting Star Ranch refers to use of an existing road located on National Forest System land in the SE 1/4 of Section 30, T8S, R7E in Cinnabar Basin, on the Gardiner Ranger District. The Shooting Star Ranch (SSR) has been using this segment of road to gain private vehicle access to its intermingled ranch lands in Sections 29 and 31. The travel plan decision is to close this road to motorized vehicles. If SSR desires to drive its vehicles on this road in the future, SSR would need to submit a request to the Forest Service, and gain written authorization prior to driving on this restricted use road.
Ron Jarrett	Hawley Mountain Ranch	821	McLeod	The restriction of horses from trails during the spring until June 15 appears to be a broad brush approach that is unneeded and stops traditional and historic use that is useful and provides economic benefit to the road. At Hawley Mountain Ranch we have a small amount of use prior to June 15, but it is needed to prepare for the season. We clear trails ahead of our season opening, which helps train new guides with the trails and helps the horses get prepared for the season.	Horses	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II in The Description of Alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Liz Jackson		21		Please don't close existing snowmobile use areas. Please don't close the Sky Top area through to Rough Lake, the trail to Marianne Lake, Lake Estelle, Martin Lake, etc.	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	Alternative 7M would not restrict snowmobile traffic in the Woody Creek area south of highway 212 (from the Republic Ck. Trail east to the State Line). The Republic Mountain recommended wilderness would be closed to snowmobiles west of the Republic Ck. Trail - this area receives little or no snowmobile use now due to heavy timber cover. Alternative 7M would institute a seasonal restriction to stock in the trailless portion of the Beartooth Plateau, and prohibit overnight stock use in the fragile trailless portion of the area instead of a total prohibition as outlined in other alternatives. See the summer non-motorized map of alternative 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Robert Everson		911	Billings	I backpacked the Beartooth Mtns in my earlier years and currently take horses in annually. I love the backcountry and would hate to lose the access b/c I am a senior citizen and I cannot backpack in.	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	No alternative proposes to entirely prohibit stock use on the Beartooth Plateau. In response to comments on the DEIS, the proposed closure area in the trail-less portion of the plateau would be managed in alternative 7M with a seasonal prohibition to stock (no stock travel prior to August 1) and would prohibit overnight stock use in this same area. See Alt. 7M summer non-motorized map.
Tom Heintz	Gallatin Outfitters Assn	1014	Bozeman	AB Plateau: While we recognized that these high environs are fragile and slow to heal we do not believe the appropriate solution to what at this point is relatively minor resource damage is to close the area to all horseback users. Education, monitoring, requiring a permit and penalties for resource damage are options that would be a better choice and have not been considered here.	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	Based on comments from stock users, and suggestions for alternative mitigation measures as opposed to outright prohibitions Alternative 7M modifies the closure proposed in the DEIS. Alternative 7M would institute a seasonal stock restriction (stock would be prohibited prior to August 1) in the trailless portion of the Beartooth Plateau, and would prohibit overnight stock use in the fragile trailless portion of the area instead of a total prohibition as outlined in other alternatives. See the summer non-motorized map of alternative 7M. There would be no seasonal restrictions in alternative 7M to stock on the trail system, except on the Marianne Lake Trail. This would allow stock access to the most popular portions of the plateau as soon as weather permits.
Ron Nusbaum		1106	Absarokee	The trail from Theil Lake to martin Basin needs to be realigned or closed to animal travel - it is much to steep and dangerous. It is simply inhuman treatment of an animal to get it into such a place.	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	In the preferred alternative, this trail would be managed primarily for foot travel, travel by stock would be allowed but not encouraged. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
David Schliz	Beartooth Backcountry Horsemen	1125	Absarokee	The proposed 34,000 acre area of the Beartooth Plateau - The Beartooth Backcountry Horsemen see this as really a restriction to stock use only, and that this area would be open to all other non-motorized/mechanized users. The word closure is misleading and implies closure to all.	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	The alternative maps and detailed description of the alternatives in the DEIS only state that stock use would be prohibited within this area.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
David Schliz		1125		By looking at your rationale and reviewing the alternatives analysis in the DEIS, it is unclear where these point to point trails are located, number of miles of said trails, and what effect stock use specifically has on erosion and vegetation. Nor does the analysis and rationale demonstrate whether stock users only are generating this series of user created trails, justifying closure (restriction) to stock use.	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	No attempt was made to inventory all the user created trails, or impacted sites on the forest related to stock use. Monitoring over time on the Beartooth Plateau has shown an increase in the number of user created routes and impacted sites but exact mileages or locations are unavailable. The DEIS and FEIS in Chapter 3 - Effects Analysis in both the Wilderness and Soils chapters address the effect that stock have on erosion and vegetation damage. We don't believe that only stock use is responsible for the damage observed, but research well documents that stock use is more impactive than foot travel (see the effects sections for specific citations).
David Schliz		1125		You reference safety concerns for the user. It is unclear in your analysis and rationale what the safety and concerns to stock users are, justifying closure (restriction). What is your rationale, for using safety in closing stock use in a Wilderness setting?	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	Safety concerns identified in the DEIS specifically were noted for the Lava Lake and Pine Creek Lakes trails - the issue is the tremendous amount of pedestrian traffic these trails receive. The safety concern is mixing stock traffic with very heavy pedestrian traffic on trails that don't provide safe options for the two user groups to safely pass on steep narrow congested trails. Alternative 7M and the ROD would address this issue by prohibiting stock use on these trails during the most congested months, and allowing fall traffic (see the detailed description of the decision).
David Schliz		1125		In looking at the alternatives analysis, it does not appear that enough site-specific analysis has been conducted to disclose the effects to this resource to conclude this area is unsuitable for stock use justifying this closure.	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	Research has well documented the effect that stock has on fragile alpine environments. Please see the analysis in the FEIS in Chapter 3 under Wilderness and Soils. Please note also that proposed stock use restrictions for the Absaroka-Beartooth Plateau were modified in Alternative 7-M of Final EIS from what was included for Alternative 7 of the Draft EIS. Refer to page C-1 of the Final EIS for a summary of this change.
David Schliz		1125		In reference to your proposed trail closures of the Zimmer Creek Trail #574, and the Mariane Lake Trail #570 and the Lower Aero Lake Trail #573, site specific analysis has not been conducted to disclose the effects to the wilderness resource, by eliminating stock use on these trails. Further, it is unclear on the DEIS summer non-motorized map as to the correct trail numbering convention for the above mentioned trails, leading to Zimmer Lake and Lower Aero Lake.	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	Thank you for the comment about confusion with the summer non-motorized maps. The route labels in Chapter II AB Plateau Map have been corrected in the FEIS. The Zimmer Creek Trail #574 and Lower Aero Lake Trail #573 have had condition inventories competed, and it is the professional judgment of District and Forest Trail managers that these trails are not suitable for stock travel, nor can they be readily reconstructed to be suitable for stock travel without undue effects to the wilderness resource. In Alternative 7M trail to Mariane Lake #570 will be open to day use travel after July 31, but will not be managed as a stock

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						route with that use emphasized.
David Schliz		1125		The Albino and Jasper Lakes, Sommerville Lake, the area north of Elaine Lake, Hidden Lake, Martin Lake, and Sky Top Creek. Beartooth Backcountry Horsemen feel a range of opportunities exist for stock use and access in these areas. Again closure (restriction) of these areas has not been specifically analyzed to determine the effects of stock use.	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	Research has well documented the affect that stock has on fragile alpine environments. Please see the analysis in the FEIS in Chapter 3 under Wilderness and Soils. Please note also that proposed stock use restrictions for the Absaroka-Beartooth Plateau were modified in Alternative 7-M of Final EIS from what was included for Alternative 7 of the Draft EIS. Refer to page C-1 of the Final EIS for a summary of this change. Alternative 7M will allow day use stock travel to these areas after July 31when the area is the driest and most resilient.
Ernest C. Strum		1133	Red Lodge	Recreational saddle and pack stock use should be accommodated within each portion of the AB wilderness where it historically existed at the time the wilderness was designated and trails should be maintained to the standard that existed at that time.	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	In response to comments from stock users, alternative 7M would institute a seasonal stock restriction (stock would be prohibited prior to August 1) in the trailless portion of the Beartooth Plateau, and would prohibit overnight stock use in the fragile trailless portion of the area instead of a total prohibition as outlined in other alternatives. See the summer non-motorized map of alternative 7M.
Rich Inman et al	Gallatin Valley Back Country Horsemen	428a		Beartooth Plateau: We are opposed to blanket closures and therefore opposed to this closure. We would support site specific closures based on resource damage. An alternative might be access on a permit only system.	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	In response to comments from stock users, alternative 7M would institute a seasonal stock restriction (stock would be prohibited prior to August 1) in the trailless portion of the Beartooth Plateau, and would prohibit overnight stock use in the fragile trailless portion of the area instead of a total prohibition as outlined in other alternatives. See the summer non-motorized map of alternative 7M.
Russ Pool		1783	Bozeman	The Beartooth Plateau area should be a day ride area - no overnight horse use (picketing, grazing, etc.).	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	In response to comments from stock users, alternative 7M would institute a seasonal stock restriction (stock would be prohibited prior to August 1) in the trailless portion of the Beartooth Plateau, and would prohibit overnight stock use in the fragile trailless portion of the area instead of a total prohibition as outlined in other alternatives. See the summer non-motorized map of alternative 7M.
David Klatt		592	West Yellowstone	Mariane Lake Trail, Zimmer Creek trail: These Trails are rocky and Rough-They do not need to be closed, apply opportunity exists for those who want to get away from people. If off-trail is a problem limit outfitters to the trail. This will not be a problem.	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	Limiting outfitter use to specific trails is a good suggestion, but outside the scope of this decision. Marianne and Zimmer Ck. Trails would have seasonal prohibitions to stock use (prior to Aug. 1) with overnight stock use prohibited in Alternative 7M.
Tim Shinabarger		272	Billings	I would like to see the Russell Creek trail left open to stock use. Due to the rough terrain this trail passes	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	The Russell Creek Trail #567 would be open to stock in all alternatives.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				through, horse users rarely leave the trail. The trail is fairly solid and provides a nice pass through when used in conjunction with East Rosebud.		
Eric Albus		202	Hinsdale	I do not feel that any closure to livestock are necessary in the Wilderness Area. Pack stock use is about the only way most folks will ever be able to see the backcountry. It seems that there is an underlying current to eliminate use of our forests, and other remote areas.	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	Alternative 7M would manage fragile areas of the Plateau for seasonal stock restrictions, and prohibit overnight stock use in some locations (see the Alt. 7M summer non-motorized map). The Wilderness Act gives several mandates: to manage wilderness for the use and enjoyment of the American People, while preserving wilderness character. It goes on to further define in Sec. 2 c wilderness as an area that "generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable..." In cases where recreation use of wilderness is leaving lasting impacts - the Agency is compelled to manage those impacts to preserve wilderness character. This may involve restrictions on certain uses including stock in critical locations. The Gallatin NF has no intent to eliminate valid recreational uses in wilderness, including stock.
Tim Shinabarger		272	Billings	My only other concern would be the closure of the high plateau are to stock use. I believe it is a mistake to believe that the point to point trails are being caused by horse use. From my experience foot traffic is just as hard on this country as horses. When I patrolled this area I found horse use to be actually quite low due to the nature of the terrain once off the built up trails. Most of all the horse use was by the outfitters operating out of Cooke City. Of course they are aware of the problems caused by leaving the trails in the softer ground of the plateau, and should cooperate in preserving the area.	Absaroka Beartooth Plateau	We are aware that all traffic contributes to "user created" routes on the Plateau. We agree that commercial users of the Plateau need to be part of long term solutions to effective stewardship of this wilderness resource.
David Molebash	Montana Ranch Company	677		Wallace Pass Trail (#623). I believe there is a recommendation to keep this trail closed until early July of each year to prevent erosion. While there are years where this trail would be closed due to snow and blow down up until his date, outfitters and the public should be allowed to attempt the trail at an earlier date. Outfitters especially should be allowed earlier access so that the trail can be cut out for use by them and the public. I would suggest an early to mid June date to open the trail.	Absaroka Beartooth Wilderness	The seasonal restriction to stock proposed for this route in the DEIS has been dropped in the FEIS Alternative 7M, the preferred alternative.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Gary Francis and Shelly Francis	Black Otter Guide Service	1672		The proposal to close the Wallace pass trail until July 15th is, to say the least, ridiculous as: all the high passes will automatically close when they become snowbound and they should open when they are passable in the summer. Keeping passes closed until July 15 reduces our business an all other Outfitters' summer business by about 25% which none of us can afford. We have cleared that trail up to the pass in June just about every year for the past 38 years and at that time we have been able to estimate when the trail over the pass will be open which is generally been the week after the 4th of July.	Absaroka Beartooth Wilderness	The seasonal restriction proposed for this route in the DEIS has been dropped in alternative 7M. In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Duane and Ruth Neal	Black Otter Guide Service	472	Pray	The Big Creek Road from Mountain Sky Guest Ranch to the trailhead should be left open until Dec.15th to allow sufficient time for us and other users of the Forest to remove our camps. We do have a permit to operate a guide service in that area and we are allowed 10 days to remove our camps after hunting season. I have been told that the FS would give us a key to the locked gate just above Mountain Sky Guest Ranch if we needed to get to the trailhead. This would not only be an unnecessary inconvenience but it could also cause unnecessary friction between the general public who couldn't go through the gate and the Outfitter who has a key.	Access	Thank your for your comment. Alternative 7M proposes to close this road to general public travel on December 1. Administrative access may be afforded to permittees who need additional accommodations after that date. Parking will be provided at the lower gate, general access to the Big Creek Drainage will be provided from that point after December 1. Hunters wishing to leave their camps in after early December will have access to the drainage by foot or stock travel from the lower gate and parking area.
Virginia A. Milne and David B. Milne		676		To improve relations with the public and make the forest accessible to more people, access into the national forest by families and the physically challenged should be improved. There are growing numbers of people in this area who need more places like the Grotto Falls and Palisade Falls trails, and the trail in the Langohr Campground area. Some popular locations that could be good for this would be Fairy Lake and accessible trails paralleling heavily damaged trails like that to Rat Lake.	Access	We agree with your comments. Several routes on the Forest are currently being considered for trail improvements to accommodate the "physically challenged" outside of this decision. The Travel Plan decision however does not address specific facilities issues like trail development - rather only evaluates the appropriateness of types of use on roads and trails. During the summer of 2006, in a decision separate from the Travel Plan, the trail to Fairy Lake is being reconstructed to meet accessible standards. Please see the FEIS pages 3-469 - 3-470 for a discussion on Accessibility of Forest Trails.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	Opportunities for cross country skiers are nearly non-existent. Currently, there is not a single area of the Forest side aside for skiers where snowmobiles are prohibited. All the marked ski trails that I have ever	Access	We recognize the current shortage of quality opportunities for cross country skiers and are addressing that need along with lack of good plowed access to ski trails in this travel plan. Currently the Rendezvous Ski

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				found are located in areas, such as Moser Creek, that are inaccessible in winter and heavily used by snowmobiles.		trail system provides an extensive area for cross country skiing where snowmobiles are prohibited. Alternative 7M will prohibit snowmobiles on all groomed ski trails, and on at least 66% of all the marked ski trails on the forest. This is a significant increase over current conditions (see the FEIS page 3-463), where only 13% of marked ski trails are in snowmobile prohibited areas. Several popular areas for cross country skiing will be managed as non-motorized in Alternative 7M, including portions of the Bridgers, lower Bear Canyon, Hyalite to name a few. Please see the winter map in the ROD.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	The travel plan proposes a few good measures, but does not go far enough. Closing South and Middle Brackett to snowmobiles is a good gesture but half of that area will soon be lost to private ownership when the land exchange there is finalized. Closing Hyalite Canyon to snowmobiles and plowing the road to the reservoir will provide wonderful ski opportunities, but what assurance are there the road will be plowed regularly and promptly?	Access	Alternative 7M adds several new non-motorized ski areas, including a significant portion of the Bridgers, the Sunlight drainage in the Crazies, lower Bear Canyon, the Yellowmule Trails, and most of the area in Hyalite. While there are no guaranteed funds for plowing winter access to these areas, there is a high likelihood that with community support, partnerships, state/local government involvement, and private support that consistent plowing and improved access will be the norm in the future. Should plowing funds for Hyalite fall short, there are several back up strategies that will still provide for segregated non-motorized skiing opportunities (see the FEIS page 3-465). Please see the Record of Decision for more discussion on back up plans for plowing Hyalite.
Kerry White		1616		Hunters should be allowed game retrieval by ATV. Many physically challenged hunters rely on some sort of transportation to remove game. The 01, 3 state OHV rule allows for handicapped access off trail. This rule is in effect at this time and we proposed the 01 rule be applied to Alt 1 of the FS travel Plan. CBU can only support Alt 1.	ATVs	The Montana Dakota OHV Decision of 2001 does not allow cross country vehicle travel for game retrieval for any hunter. Current Region 1 policy does allow local Line Officers to designate specific routes which are closed to general motorized use as open for hunters with disabilities with appropriate State licensing. Standard D-4 in Alternative 7M will allow local line officers to continue this route specific access for hunters with disabilities through a site specific permit on administrative or project roads. Cross country travel off of these specific designated routes for game retrieval is prohibited.
Bill Neubauer		328		Something to consider is the difficulty in managing those trails which go from an ATV route to a non-motorized or single track route.	ATVs	We agree with your comments. We have attempted to avoid this situation where loop opportunities or other route connectors make that possible. In situations where an ATV trail becomes a motorcycle only or non-motorized route, we have attempted to end the ATV trail

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						at a logical terminus - such as a ridge, overlook or trail junction.
Keith Allen		1770		There are some things the FS can do to diminish and mitigate the negative impacts of ATV: helmet requirements, pass rules/guidelines making it illegal to drink and drive an ATV, signage on all trails stating where ATVs are and are not permitted. Support and/or implement a statewide OHV registration program with completion of a safety and responsible use course a prerequisite to receiving an OHV sticker/permit. I realize this may be beyond the scope of this plan but it could be used in lieu of more strict guidelines in the Gallatin and provide a powerful incentive at the state level for action.	ATVs	We appreciate your comments. Many of your suggestions are under the purview of State government, or outside the scope of this decision. The Forest intends to work diligently with the State and cooperators to improve voluntary compliance with ethical riding principles.
Jeffrey Ball		1002	Bozeman	I walked up Stone Creek last fall and every ridge let had two-track on it, spent shotgun and 22 casings. They were off trail, violating the Travel Plan and quite possibly violating game laws pursuing Blue Grouse from a vehicle. Close the Bangtails from motorized from 9/1 through the end of upland bird season (12/15)	Bangtails	The Forest Service has a goal to provide a variety of recreation opportunities, including motorized opportunities within reasonable travel distance of communities. The Bangtails have a long history of established motorized use, an extensive network of old roads and trails that based on our analysis are suitable for OHV use. Alternative 7M will manage the road system in the area to provide primary access in the fall, with the bulk of the trail system closing to motorized use on 10/15 prior to the big game hunting season. The proliferation of user created routes in the Bangtails will be closed with this decision, and motorized users will have to use the designated trail system. This clear delineation of designated routes should help to quell the trespass off route. Many of the user created routes and old roads that are in excess of what is needed to provide a quality trail system will be rehabilitated in time. Some of that work is being accomplished during the summer of 2006 with watershed restoration dollars.
Noreen Breeding		1004	Bozeman	Designation of trail #504 as a marked x-c trail is an error b/c access is nearly impossible and skiing on the ridge unpleasant. The Brackett Creek and Stone Creek approaches are steep, narrow winding trails w/ many switchbacks on heavily wooded north-facing slopes making for difficult skiing.	Bangtails	Trail #504 would be designated as a ski/snowshoe marked routes from the Brackett Y south to Grassy Mountain and from the Stone Creek Trailhead east to an overlook below the Bangtail Divide. The connection between these two short routes would be dropped in Alternative 7M. While we are aware these are challenging ski trails, they would provide an quality opportunity for snowshoeing, with easy access, and are suitable for more advanced skiers.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Shelly McMullen	BWAGs	1028	Bozeman	Bangtails: There are several switchbacks in areas and there is no way they can see people in time to stop if they are going at high speeds.	Bangtails	We recognize there are areas on the Forest with "blind" corners and mixed use. The travel plan decision does not address "facility condition" issues, rather only the appropriate use of those routes. Facility conditions issues will be addressed site specifically at a later date.
Anne Banks	BWAGS	1177	Bozeman	Heavy snowmobile use on the Olsen Creek road makes it unpleasant and at times dangerous to ski.	Bangtails	Alternative 7M, the preferred alternative , does not propose to manage the Olson Creek road as a designated ski route.
Mark Weirich		1610	Bozeman	I have noticed that basically all of the single track in the Bangtails has been given to the mountain bikers. I typically ride my dirt bike on these trails at least 2 nights a week in the summer, and would like to continue to do so. If is a short distance from town and it gets us away from the 4-wheelers.	Bangtails	Alternative 7M would manage the Bangtail Divide Trail #504 as a single track route where both mountain biking and motorcycling are emphasized. This is the longest single track in the Bangtails and would be managed for motorcycling.
Kerry White		1616		#504 is identified by the county as open to motorized use. 504 comes out of Stone Creek and there is a lot of private land in the beginning. If you go up Jackson Creek and get on 977 to 510 or 555 you can get to 504 and this trail goes all the way to Brackett Creek. I snowmobile in this area quite a few times a year but we access through Olson Creek. The high meadows to the south have lots of small cornices that my family loves to play on and jump off of. You can look down on Livingston and have a great view of Absaroka's and the Crazy's.	Bangtails	Alternative 7M would manage the Bangtail Divide Trail #504 as a single track route where both mountain biking and motorcycling are emphasized. The entire area with the exception of a small closure around the 504 trail from the Brackett Y south to Grassy Mountain would be open to snowmobiling. The Forest Service has jurisdiction and management responsibility for all National Forest System trails and roads on the Gallatin National Forest. The Forest Service has no information or evidence to indicate that Gallatin County has asserted rights to Trail #504 or to any other National Forest System trail or road on the Gallatin National Forest.
Kerry White		1616		Most of the summer riding in this area is done on logging roads and is not much fun on ATVs and motorcycles. Logging roads are okay but the old trails are a different experience and need to be available to motorized users.	Bangtails	Alternative 7M would manage the Bangtail Divide Trail #504 as a single track route where both mountain biking and motorcycling are emphasized. This is the longest single track in the Bangtails and would be managed for motorcycling.
Patti Steinmuller		1132		Bangtails: Because to the popularity of trail #504 with hikers, horseback riders, and mountain bikes, I recommend that this trail be designated as non-motorized. The trail is steep at both ends and conflicts with motorized users are especially prone to occur as motorcycles accelerate to climb hills and proceed around corners.	Bangtails	Alternative 7M would manage the Bangtail Divide Trail #504 as a single track route where both mountain biking and motorcycling are emphasized. Hiking and stock use would be allowed on this route, but not emphasized. We intend to supply information to different user groups in the form of user guides/maps/brochures that allow them to chose areas that provide the best opportunity for their sport and to make informed choices about avoiding areas where opportunities may not be optimal for their chosen activity. Included in this effort will be an education and information campaign on "shared use" routes that informs users about backcountry etiquette for

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						these situations.
Patti Steinmuller		1132		Despite increased interest by the public in cross-country skiing and snowshoeing, designated areas for these types of winter recreation are limited and inadequate. Also, certain trails, e.g. Bangtails #504 and Tepee Trail, where cross-country skiing and snowshoeing are listed in the Travel Plan as emphasized are not appropriate for these activities due to very limited snow cover. Although cross-country skiers do not need groomed trails in the front country or backcountry, they do need access to rolling terrain with sufficient snow cover. Also needed are areas that are distinct and separate from areas where snowmobiling is permitted or emphasized.	Bangtails	Alternative 7M would increase the number of designated ski trails and ski trails within non-motorized areas over current conditions. Areas where additional non-motorized cross country ski trails would be added include Hyalite, Sunlight Basin, Spanish Creek, Bear Canyon, South Fk. Brackett Ck. and Mill Creek. Tepee Creek is not proposed to be a designated ski trail in Alternative 7M (this was a map error - the correction was published on the web site on the errata sheet). Bangtail Trail #504 would provide a more challenging ski route and an easily accessed snowshoe route. Snowmobiles would be prohibited in most of the proposed focus areas for cross country skiing and snowshoeing in alternative 7M.
Eva Patten and Patti Steinmuller	BWAGs	467	Bozeman	Summer: GNF has upgraded trail #504 from Brackett Creek to Stone Creek, and it is terrific. However, the trail is congested due to heavy use by bicycles, horses, and motorcycles as well as hikers. Since it is narrow and steep at both ends, there are unavoidable near collisions, especially on weekends. This is not a good place for motorcycles. We recommend non-motorized use for trail #504. Winter: Trail #504 is reserved for skiers and snowshoers. However, because of the steep ascent, difficulty in negotiating the switchbacks, and limited snow coverage this trail is not practical as a site for skiers.	Bangtails	Thank you for your comments on trail #504. Alternative 7M would manage the Bangtail Divide Trail #504 as a single track route where both mountain biking and motorcycling are emphasized. Hiking and stock use would be allowed on this route, but not emphasized. We intend to supply information to different user groups in the form of user guides/maps/brochures that allow them to chose areas that provide the best opportunity for their sport and to make informed choices about avoiding areas where opportunities may not be optimal for their chosen activity. Included in this effort will be an education and information campaign on "shared use" routes that informs users about backcountry etiquette for these situations. Trail #504 would be designated as a ski/snowshoe marked routes from the Brackett Y south to Grassy Mountain and from the Stone Creek Trailhead east to an overlook below the Bangtail Divide. The connection between these two short routes would be dropped in Alternative 7M. While we are aware these are challenging ski trails, they would provide an quality opportunity for snowshoeing, with easy access, and are suitable for more advanced skiers.
Thomas Pick		329		it has been my observation that a great deal of off trail use by motorcycles, 4x4s and ATVs occurs in this area. Most of the accessible meadows have multiple rutted trails running through them. For this reason, I'd suggest a greater deal of patrolling to	Bangtails	We have also observed a serious amount of illegal off-route travel in the Bangtails. In some areas this is occurring on private land, in some areas on National Forest. Through the implementation of this travel plan decision, a clear system of designated roads and trails

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				enforce restrictions to trail use in this area. I'd like to see the use of seasonal closures also to protect wildlife security in this heavily harvested area during the spring and fall (hunting season) when it seems that most violations occur.		for motorized use will be employed. The National OHV decision of 2005 clarified regulations under which we will implement this decision, and will make enforcement of illegal cross country travel much easier in the future. This along with an aggressive information and education campaign should help us curb this illegal activity. Alternative 7M proposes to manage the primary access roads in the Bangtails as open from May 15 or June 15 through December 1. Trails would be open to motorized use from June 15 - October 15, with fall closure going in place prior to the big game hunting season.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		This area is a popular non-motorized destination in spring, as snow melt occurs here relatively early and the ridge and adjacent meadows from Stone Creek north often have spectacular displays of early spring wildflowers. We favor designation of Trail #504 as motor-free for its entire length.	Bangtails	Alternative 7M proposes to allow foot, stock and mountain bike travel on the routes in the Bangtails year round. Motorized use of these routes would be restricted to June 15 - October 15 on trails to protect the trail facility during spring break up, and to minimize user conflicts in the fall. Trail #504 is proposed to be emphasized for both mountains biking and motorcycling. Hiking and stock use would be allowed, but not encouraged. The Forest Service has a goal to provide a variety of recreation opportunities, including motorized opportunities within reasonable travel distance of communities. The Bangtails have a long history of established motorized use, an extensive network of old roads and trails that based on our analysis are suitable for OHV use.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		In winter, #504 is designated as a marked cross-country ski trail, but the value of this trail is limited for two reasons. First, the two approaches, from Brackett Creek and Stone Creek, are steep, narrow, winding trails that were not designed for skiing. Second, snowmobilers use Olson Creek extensively, and although the ski trail is separated from the snowmobile area, they are too close together to provide a quality ski experience. The noise of the machines will be clearly audible from the ski trail, and snowmobiles can easily stray into the ski area, destroying ski tracks and making it dangerous to ski here.	Bangtails	Trail #504 would be designated as a ski/snowshoe marked routes from the Brackett Y south to Grassy Mountain and from the Stone Creek Trailhead east to an overlook below the Bangtail Divide. The connection between these two short routes would be dropped in Alternative 7M. While we are aware these are challenging ski trails, they would provide an quality opportunity for snowshoeing, with easy access, and are suitable for more advanced skiers.
Chris Naumann		1454		The Bangtails seem to be the GNFs sacrificial lamb…the true embodiment of "multiple use" - which is fine in my mind. I think the Bangtails should be designated as the "close to town" motorized area.	Bangtails	The Forest has a goal to provide a wide variety of recreation opportunities close to communities. The Bangtails provide a series of old roads and trails that are suitable for OHV use, as well as mountain biking. Hiking

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Stone and Olson Creek, and even Grassy Mountain, trailheads are closer to town than S. Bracket, Ross Pass, Truman or M. Cottonwood. Specifically regarding Alternative 7 for the Bangtail Mountains: Grassy Mountain to Stone Creek Trail #504 should be completely open to motorcycles, but closed to ATVs. The entire range should be open to snowmobiling in the winter.		and stock use will be permissible on these routes in Alternative 7M, but will not be emphasized. Trail #504 is proposed to be managed as a single track mountain bike and motorcycle route, with ATV's prohibited. The entire Bangtail Range, with the exception of one small area in the Northwest corner - near Trail #504 would be open to snowmobiles. This area is one where the Forest Service intends to provide concentrated and intensively managed motorized recreation opportunities.
Joe Polus		1487		Proposed Bracket Cr Snowmobile Closure - Need access thru this closure to get to open country on west side of Bridgers (over pass at Sacagawea Pk). Closing Bracket Creek area to snomobilers would be like closing the M to hikers - this is a big deal. There was discussion about moving the northern closure boundary (Frazier Lk Area) one more ridge to the North. This would allow for a Natural Terrain Boundary which would eliminate enforcement issues.	Bangtails	The Forest received many comments from the public about the proposed winter snowmobile closures in the preferred alternative in the DEIS on the east side of the Bridgers - both pro and con. Based on feedback from snowmobilers, backcountry skiers and Mt Fish Wildlife and Parks biologists, a revised closure map was created that provides more of the challenging snowmobile terrain that is currently available, while still providing protection for critical winter wildlife habitat, and segregated areas for backcountry skiing. The North Fork of Brackett Creek, Fairy Lake/Creek and the Carroll Creek area would be managed for snowmobiling. Access is also provided to the ridge above Fairy Lake. This configuration would allow snowmobile access to popular play areas, and to areas that would be managed as non-motorized for backcountry skiing. Please see the Alternative 7M winter map for a complete picture of the trail system and open areas.
Alan Oram		713		This part of the range is the one that should be given over to the motorized use crowd as it is already reasonably trashed with motorized use. Allow motorized access in this range.	Bangtails	The Forest has a goal to provide a wide variety of recreation opportunities close to communities. The Bangtails provide a series of old roads and trails that are suitable for OHV use, as well as mountain biking. Hiking and stock use will be permissible on these routes in Alternative 7M, but will not be emphasized. The entire Bangtail Range, with the exception of one small area in the Northwest corner - near Trail #504 would be open to snowmobiles. This area is one where the Forest Service intends to provide concentrated and intensively managed motorized recreation opportunities.
David Gaillard		303		From the southern Bangtails, and dirt bikes should be restricted from the southwest side of both the Bangtail and Bridger Ranges.	Bangtails	Alternative 7M proposes to manage the portion of the Grassy Mountain Trail #504 that drops into Stone Creek in the southwest corner of the Bangtails as a non-motorized route, emphasizing hiking, biking and stock use yearlong. This will also be managed as a marked xc

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						ski/snowshoe route in the winter. Several of the trails in the southwest corner of the Bridgers are proposed to be managed as non-motorized routes (The "M", Sypes Canyon, Bridger Foothills from the "M" to Middle Cottonwood, Bostwick). Additionally, the preferred alternative proposes to manage other routes that will be open to motorized uses on a staggered use system where on certain times of the summer these routes would be closed to motorized uses. The exact system of shared use will be decided after the travel plan record of decision is completed, with input from various interested user groups.
Noreen Breeding		454		Designation of trail #504 as a marked cross-country ski trail is an error because access is nearly impossible and skiing on the ride unpleasant. The Brackett Creek and Stone Creek approaches are steep, narrow, winding trails with many switchbacks on heavily wooded north-facing slopes, making for difficult skiing, and Olson Creek road is extensively flattened and iced over by snowmobiling. Although the ski trail is separated from the snowmobile trail and play areas on top of the ridge, they are so close together that the presence of snowmobiles will disturb skiers, and snowmobile travel off trail is guaranteed to destroy ski tracks. The best approach is to emphasize motorized recreation in the Bangtails and forget about providing hiking or skiing opportunities there in favor of providing them somewhere else where motor vehicles can be prohibited, such as Bear Canyon.	Bangtails	Trail #504 would be designated as a ski/snowshoe marked routes from the Brackett Y south to Grassy Mountain and from the Stone Creek Trailhead east to an overlook below the Bangtail Divide. The connection between these two short routes would be dropped in Alternative 7M. We are not proposing to manage Olson Creek as a ski trail in any alternative. While we are aware these are challenging ski trails, they would provide an accessible opportunity for snowshoeing, and are suitable for more advanced skiers. Alternative 7M also proposes to manage the first two miles of Bear Canyon 440 trail as a ski trail that is closed to snowmobiles.
Greg Beardslee	Gallatin Ridge Riders Contact - Gallatin Valley Bicycle Club	1785	Bozeman	6 weeks ago the Bangtail Divide trail #504 was a single-track trail upper Stone Creek to Grassy mountain. Now it is a double track trail through that whole distance. The 504 trail needs entrance gates or posts or something to create chokes to deter the ATVs advance. The upper metal cattle guard at Stone Creek needs to be made narrower, to stop ATVs.	Bangtails	Thank you for your comment. We are aware that several of our proposed "single track" motorcycle and mountain bikes have been used repeatedly by ATV's to the point that two tracks have developed. The travel plan decision simply addresses what uses are appropriate on these routes, not the condition of the facility itself. Future work to address rehabilitation of these routes will follow the travel plan decision, and be covered under stand alone NEPA decisions.
Loren Blanksma		1194		This area is conducive to motorized uses, ironically simply because it is not good enough for the other more important users. All trails and roads should remain open to motorized. That would still leave part	Bangtails	The Forest has a goal to provide a wide variety of recreation opportunities close to communities. The Bangtails provide a series of old roads and trails that are suitable for OHV use, as well as mountain biking. Hiking

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				of Bangtail Divide in the Stone Creek drainage as non-motorized.		and stock use will be permissible on these routes in Alternative 7M, but will not be emphasized. The entire Bangtail Range, with the exception of one small area in the Northwest corner - near Trail #504 would be open to snowmobiles. This area is one where the Forest Service intends to provide concentrated and intensively managed motorized recreation opportunities.
Doug Chabot		1229		While the Bangtails are open to snowmobilers I caution you to not compare the two areas. The Bangtails are mostly lower angled terrain that's pretty limited in riding acreage while the Bridgers provide a wide range of riding opportunities for the larger public.	Bangtails	The Forest recognizes the difference in opportunities provided for snowmobiling in the Bridgers vs. the Bangtails. Both places provide popular riding terrain for different experience levels. Snowmobiling opportunities would be provided in alternative 7M in both locations, including "challenge" riding in the Bridgers near Fairy Lake.
Dennis Zindler		873	Bozeman	Trail 504 - Bangtail - Olson to Jackson - Motorized - Summer and winter leave open. This area is close to Bozeman and a great trail for the family to ride after work or on weekends.	Bangtails	The Forest has a goal to provide a wide variety of recreation opportunities close to communities. The Bangtails provide a series of old roads and trails that are suitable for OHV use, as well as mountain biking. Hiking and stock use will be permissible on these routes in Alternative 7M, but will not be emphasized. The entire Bangtail Range, with the exception of one small area in the Northwest corner - near Trail #504 would be open to snowmobiles. This area is one where the Forest Service intends to provide concentrated and intensively managed motorized recreation opportunities.
Todd Orr		840		504 - Grassy mountain - suggest managing as open to motorcycle use on lower end above Brackett and open to ATV along ridgetop.	Bangtails	Alternative 7M proposes to manage the Bangtail Divide Trail #504 as a single track opportunity for both mountain bikes and motorcycles north of Stone Creek. This route will be managed for single track uses however, with ATV opportunities provided on several other routes along the ridge. Please see the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.
Todd Orr		840		555 - Jackson Creek - suggest managing as open to motorcycle use.	Bangtails	Alternative 7M proposes to manage the Jackson Creek Trail #555 as open to motorcycles and ATV's from June 15 - October 15.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	Designation of trail #504 as a marked cross country trail is an error because access in nearly impossible and skiing on the ridge unpleasant. The Brackett Creek and Stone Creek approaches are steep, narrow, winding trails with many switchbacks on heavily wooded north facing slopes, making for difficult skiing, and Olsen Creek road is extensively flattened and iced over by snowmobiling.	Bangtails	Trail #504 would be designated as a ski/snowshoe marked routes from the Brackett Y south to Grassy Mountain and from the Stone Creek Trailhead east to an overlook below the Bangtail Divide. The connection between these two short routes would be dropped in Alternative 7M. We are not proposing to manage Olson Creek as a ski trail in any alternative. While we are aware these are challenging ski trails, they would

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						provide an accessible opportunity for snowshoeing, and are suitable for more advanced skiers. Alternative 7M also proposes to manage the first two miles of Bear Canyon 440 trail as a ski trail that is closed to snowmobiles.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	The best approach is to emphasize motorized recreation in the Bangtails and forget about providing hiking or skiing opportunities there in favor of providing them somewhere else where motorized vehicles can be prohibited, such as Bear Canyon.	Bangtails	The Forest has a goal to provide a wide variety of recreation opportunities close to communities. The Bangtails provide a series of old roads and trails that are suitable for OHV use, as well as mountain biking. Hiking and stock use will be permissible on these routes in Alternative 7M, but will not be emphasized. The entire Bangtail Range, with the exception of one small area in the Northwest corner - near Trail #504 would be open to snowmobiles. This area is one where the Forest Service intends to provide concentrated and intensively managed motorized recreation opportunities.
Tony Rasch		221	Bozeman	Under alternative 7, the Bangtails become pretty much a sacrifice where the owners of motorized vehicles can do what they want. Hikers will quickly learn to avoid this area. But motorcycles should be made by regulation to avoid extremely popular hiking areas like Middle Cottonwood.	Bangtails	The Forest has a goal to provide a wide variety of recreation opportunities close to communities. The Bangtails provide a series of old roads and trails that are suitable for OHV use, as well as mountain biking. Hiking and stock use will be permissible on these routes in Alternative 7M, but will not be emphasized. The entire Bangtail Range, with the exception of one small area in the Northwest corner - near Trail #504 would be open to snowmobiles. This area is one where the Forest Service intends to provide concentrated and intensively managed motorized recreation opportunities. The Middle Cottonwood trail is proposed to be managed for foot, stock, mountain bike and motorcycle travel under the preferred alternative. We are considering a "time share" option for the trails proposed to be open to motorcycles in the Bridgers, where at certain times during the open season, motorized use would be prohibited, and that trails managed for non-motorized uses. Please see the Record of Decision for more discussion on the "time share
Karin M. Jennings		822	Bozeman	Motorcycles are inappropriate on the Grassy Mountain Trail because of the heavy use it receives by bicycles, as well as stock being allowed on the trail. I would like to see motorized use removed from the entire ridge trail between Stone Creek and the Brackett Creek 'Y', however at a minimum I believe motorized use should be removed from Olsen Creek	Bangtails	The Bangtail Divide Trail #504 is a popular route with many users. We've heard from both the mountain biking community and the motorcyclists that this trail provides a valuable single track riding opportunity. The Forest has a goal to provide a wide variety of recreation opportunities close to communities. The Bangtails provide a series of old roads and trails that are suitable for OHV use, as

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				to the BCY.		well as mountain biking. The FEIS preferred alternative 7M proposes to manage this route for both mountain biking and motorcycling. Stock use and hiking will be allowed but not emphasized. Motorcycle use of the route is proposed to be restricted to a 4 month season between June 15 - October 15. There are no seasonal restrictions proposed for mountain biking.
Craig Kenworthy		826	Bozeman	Bangtail Divide trail #504 - do not open it to motorcycles until July 1, rather than June 15th. Because much of the trail is west facing and shaded, there are wet areas that could be eroded and damaged from early season use. When the trail becomes rutted, it is not a good trail running experience.	Bangtails	Motorcycle use of Trail #504 is proposed to be restricted to a 4 month season from June 15 - October 15. There are no seasonal restrictions proposed for mountain biking, or hiking/running. Hiking and stock use will be allowed but not emphasized on this route. Our best information indicates that this seasonal restriction will be adequate to protect the facility from undue damage during spring break up. However, in the event that we have a very wet spring, the District Ranger has the authority to postpone the opening date of this route through special order closure.
Tom O. Milesnick	Milesnick Ranch	834	Belgrade	I feel that the gate that is now in place to restrict vehicle traffic into the Fleshman Creek Drainage should remain closed. This is one of the few areas that game- elk, deer, moose, bear, mountain lion, bobcats- can inhabit year round without being distressed by motorized traffic. It is closed to the Jackson Creek drainage which has a significant amount of traffic, but keeping the road closed in this area, will protect the game and the integrity of the area.	Bangtails	The Fleshman Ck. area would continue to be managed for non-motorized uses in the preferred alternative. Please see the summer motorized map.
Carrie Palmer		957	Livingston	I have never before witnessed such devastation due to "all terrain vehicles" and "dirt bikes" in the Goose Creek area off Trail Creek road.	Bear Canyon	The Forest Service recognizes the effects of "unmanaged recreation use" in these areas. Efforts over several years to rehabilitate some of these routes have been compromised by continued off route travel . We also recognize that Bear Canyon is an important motorized recreation opportunity close to Bozeman that provides valuable short evening and 1/2 day riding opportunities. We believe key routes can be managed to provide motorized trail opportunities with appropriate investments in the trail facilities. Alternative 7M identifies several standards designed to improve water quality issues and provide short term mitigation in damaged areas. Standard 3-2 would prohibit motorized trail use, as well as horses and mountain bikes until the trail facilities could be repaired and no longer contribute

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						to sediment and water quality problems. Standard 3-3 imposes a seasonal restriction that is also designed to prevent trail damage and sedimentation (currently proposed to be open for motorized use, stock and mountain from July 15 - October 15 depending on conditions of the facilities). Alternative 7M would manage most of the routes within the Bear Canyon Travel Planning Area for summer motorized use, once the trails were repaired. In the short term, motor vehicles, stock and mountain bikes would be prohibited.
Charles Repath		965	Bozeman	Motorized trail users in Bear Canyon have done tremendous damage to that resource. I have watched motorized users drive through wet meadows and harass wildlife. I have also seen weeds spread throughout the forest along these motorized trails.	Bear Canyon	The Forest Service recognizes the effects of "unmanaged recreation use" in these areas. Efforts over several years to rehabilitate some of these routes have been compromised by continued off route travel . We also recognize that Bear Canyon is an important motorized recreation opportunity close to Bozeman that provides valuable short evening and 1/2 day riding opportunities. We believe key routes can be managed to provide motorized trail opportunities with appropriate investments in the trail facilities. Alternative 7M identifies several standards designed to improve water quality issues and provide short term mitigation in damaged areas. Standard 3-2 would prohibit motorized trail use, as well as horses and mountain bikes until the trail facilities could be repaired and no longer contribute to sediment and water quality problems. Standard 3-3 imposes a seasonal restriction that is also designed to prevent trail damage and sedimentation (currently proposed to be open for motorized use, stock and mountain from July 15 - October 15 depending on conditions of the facilities). Alternative 7M would manage most of the routes within the Bear Canyon Travel Planning Area for summer motorized use, once the trails were repaired. In the short term, motor vehicles, stock and mountain bikes would be prohibited. Important wildlife corridors along Chestnut Mountain would be closed to summer motorized uses.
Noreen Breeding		1004	Bozeman	Bear Canyon should be non-motorized. There are at least 3 river crossings that vehicle traffic has severely damaged in the first 2 miles of trail #440. Bear Canyon is a wildlife corridor between the Gallatin Range and the Bridger Range. Soils in the Bear Canyon are sensitive and prone to slumping.	Bear Canyon	The Forest Service recognizes the effects of "unmanaged recreation use" in these areas. Efforts over several years to rehabilitate some of these routes have been compromised by continued off route travel. We also recognize that Bear Canyon is an important motorized recreation opportunity close to Bozeman that

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				ATVs and motorcycles spread noxious weed seeds faster than do non-motorized travelers.		provides valuable short evening and 1/2 day riding opportunities. We believe key routes can be managed to provide motorized trail opportunities with appropriate investments in the trail facilities. Alternative 7M identifies several standards designed to improve water quality issues and provide short term mitigation in damaged areas. Standard 3-2 would prohibit motorized trail use, as well as horses and mountain bikes until the trail facilities could be repaired and no longer contribute to sediment and water quality problems. Standard 3-3 imposes a seasonal restriction that is also designed to prevent trail damage and sedimentation (currently proposed to be open for motorized use, stock and mountain from July 15 - October 15 depending on conditions of the facilities). Alternative 7M would manage most of the routes within the Bear Canyon Travel Planning Area for summer motorized use, once the trails were repaired. In the short term, motor vehicles, stock and mountain bikes would be prohibited. Important wildlife corridors along Chestnut Mountain would be closed to summer motorized uses.
Rick Meis		1030	Bozeman	Bear Canyon: classic areas of both resource damage and recreational misuse as well as an area of user conflict. Over the last number of years we have seen some pretty flagrant abuses of the use of motorized. Close to motorized use in summer trail #440 to the junction of trail #458 (on the east leg) and up to the junction of trail #53 on the west side specifically to limit significant erosion and damage to water quality. The same closures to snowmobiles in winter for recreation conflict reasons.	Bear Canyon	The Forest Service recognizes the effects of "unmanaged recreation use" in these areas. Efforts over several years to rehabilitate some of these routes have been compromised by continued off route travel . We also recognize that Bear Canyon is an important motorized recreation opportunity close to Bozeman that provides valuable short evening and 1/2 day riding opportunities. We believe key routes can be managed to provide motorized trail opportunities with appropriate investments in the trail facilities. Alternative 7M identifies several standards designed to improve water quality issues and provide short term mitigation in damaged areas. Standard 3-2 would prohibit motorized trail use, as well as horses and mountain bikes until the trail facilities could be repaired and no longer contribute to sediment and water quality problems. Standard 3-3 imposes a seasonal restriction that is also designed to prevent trail damage and sedimentation (currently proposed to be open for motorized use, stock and mountain from July 15 - October 15 depending on conditions of the facilities). Alternative 7M would manage most of the routes within the Bear Canyon

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Travel Planning Area for summer motorized use, once the trails were repaired. In the short term, motor vehicles, stock and mountain bikes would be prohibited. Important wildlife corridors along Chestnut Mountain would be closed to summer motorized uses.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Keep Bear Canyon /Bozeman Creek ridge/ New World trail open. It makes a good day trip loop by going back down Bear Canyon. This also makes a nice bicycle trip which I would think they could share. This would be the only motorized use in the Bozeman Creek Area.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M proposes to manage the 440 loop trail system, and connected routes to the Goose Creek road as open to summer and winter motorized use. In the winter, the 440 trail would be closed to snowmobiles from the Bear Canyon Trailhead to the loop trail junction, and access would be from the Goose Creek side for snowmobiles. These routes would be closed to all uses except hiking until the trail system could be repaired, and sedimentation/soil damage issues rectified.
Roger Breeding		39	Bozeman	Bear Canyon - Need to close Bear Canyon Trail to all motorized use - Summer and Winter. Trail runs thru the Creek in several places making a mess of the creek - filling stream with mud.	Bear Canyon	The travel plan will only make decisions regarding the appropriate use of roads and trails. The conditions of facilities and problems associated with facility condition will be addressed through other project analysis and maintenance planning. In the case of Bear Canyon, the Forest Service recognized that facility conditions were a significant enough problem to warrant specific standards guiding the future management of those facilities. Alternative 7M identifies several standards designed to improve water quality issues and provide short term mitigation in damaged areas. Standard 3-2 would prohibit motorized trail use, as well as horses and mountain bikes until the trail facilities could be repaired and no longer contribute to sediment and water quality problems. Standard 3-3 imposes a seasonal restriction that is also designed to prevent trail damage and sedimentation (currently proposed to be open for motorized use, stock and mountain from July 15 - October 15 depending on conditions of the facilities). We believe these standards will provide the protection necessary, until a separate analysis can be completed to address the reconstruction of the facilities. Alternative 7M does propose to manage the 440 loop trail system and connector to Goose Creek road as open so ATV's and motorcycles in the summer once the trail reconstruction is completed.
Roger Breeding		39		The trail on the west side in the summer is just one bog after another. The ATVs and motorcycles have	Bear Canyon	The travel plan will only make decisions regarding the appropriate use of roads and trails. The conditions of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				been going straight up the west side of Chestnut Mountain where it is very steep and making multiple parallel trails straight up and down.		facilities and problems associated with facility condition will be addressed through other project analysis and maintenance planning. In the case of Bear Canyon, the Forest Service recognized that facility conditions were a significant enough problem to warrant specific standards guiding the future management of those facilities. Alternative 7M identifies several standards designed to improve water quality issues and provide short term mitigation in damaged areas. Standard 3-2 would prohibit motorized trail use, as well as horses and mountain bikes until the trail facilities could be repaired and no longer contribute to sediment and water quality problems. Standard 3-3 imposes a seasonal restriction that is also designed to prevent trail damage and sedimentation (currently proposed to be open for motorized use, stock and mountain from July 15 - October 15 depending on conditions of the facilities). We believe these standards will provide the protection necessary, until a separate analysis can be completed to address the reconstruction of the facilities. Alternative 7M does propose to manage the 440 loop trail system and connector to Goose Creek road as open so ATV's and motorcycles in the summer once the trail reconstruction is completed.
Roger Breeding		39		The trail from the Bear Canyon trailhead to the old sawmill site and to Old Cooper Reservoir should be reserved for snowshoeing and x-c skiing as these people cannot go very far in a day. The snowmobiles could use the area south of Old Cooper Reservoir as they can come in from the Paradise Valley side and they travel further in an hour than a skier can travel in a day.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M proposes to manage a portion of the Bear Canyon Travel Planning area exclusively for non-motorized winter use. Trail #440 from the Bear Canyon Trailhead to the 440 loop junction would be a dedicated ski trail, with snowmobiles prohibited. Snowmobile access would be provided from the Goose Creek Trailhead.
John Frohnmayer		49	Bozeman	Please consider motorized access from the Trail Creek side rather than from Bear Canyon. Trail Creek is preferable because it is higher and would have less impact on the fragile streambed of Bear Creek.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M proposes to split motorized access into the Bear Canyon area in summer and in winter. In summer - access would be provided from the Bear Canyon side, and in winter motorized access would be from the Goose Creek Trailhead. The Bear Canyon access would be managed as non-motorized until trail/road facility repair and reconstruction could mitigate existing water quality and erosion issues. See Standards 3-2 through 3-4 in the Bear Canyon Chapter of the Detailed Description of Alternatives.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Shelly Watters and Steve Malmberg		1602	Bozeman	Bear Canyon is the poster child for the mismanagement of FS lands. We have no doubt that the area will eventually be closed for repairs (as recommended under alternative 7), but we also have no doubt that the degradation of the area will continue once those repairs are realized. The unstable soils coupled with the predominance of riparian and other wet areas make it an extremely inappropriate area for motorized recreation.	Bear Canyon	The Forest Service recognizes the effects of "unmanaged recreation use" in these areas. Efforts over several years to rehabilitate some of these routes have been compromised by continued off route travel . We also recognize that Bear Canyon is an important motorized recreation opportunity close to Bozeman that provides valuable short evening and 1/2 day riding opportunities. We believe key routes can be managed to provide motorized trail opportunities with appropriate investments in the trail facilities. Alternative 7M identifies several standards designed to improve water quality issues and provide short term mitigation in damaged areas. Standard 3-2 would prohibit motorized trail use, as well as horses and mountain bikes until the trail facilities could be repaired and no longer contribute to sediment and water quality problems. Standard 3-3 imposes a seasonal restriction that is also designed to prevent trail damage and sedimentation (currently proposed to be open for motorized use, stock and mountain from July 15 - October 15 depending on conditions of the facilities). Alternative 7M would manage most of the routes within the Bear Canyon Travel Planning Area for summer motorized use, once the trails were repaired. In the short term, motor vehicles, stock and mountain bikes would be prohibited. Important wildlife corridors along Chestnut Mountain would be closed to summer motorized uses.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Trail Creek Trail 437: this trail provides access to all the Bear Canyon in areas from the Trail Creek Road for winter snowmobile use. Closure of this trail for snowmobile use stops access to another area close to town with historical motorized use tendencies.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M would provide winter snowmobile access to the Bear Canyon TPA via the Goose Creek Road - a popular access route now. Our information indicates that the Trail Creek Trail #437 is not frequently used by snowmobiles now. Alternative 7m would retain this as a non-motorized access to the Trail Creek Cabin.
Todd Hoitsma		1340		make sure New World/Moonshine Gulch area is closed to all mechanical vehicle access, especially in winter. This is one of the few quiet assessable ski touring, and backcountry ski areas close to town. It is too small to share with any snowmobiles, including skiers who drive the snowmobiles.	Bear Canyon	The New World Gulch and Moonshine Trails are proposed to be managed as non-motorized year long in alternative 7M.
Jenny McCune	Gallatin Valley Bicycle Club	762		Bear Canyon -seeing how past enforcement efforts have gone, trying to keep motorized users off of wet trails and keeping them from going off trail, I believe that it will be impossible for the forest service to	Bear Canyon	Trail reconstruction and restoration efforts (necessary before implementing the preferred alternative) will not only focus on restoring the dedicated routes, but also on removing and providing barriers on user created routes

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				police this area to ensure that damage isn't done when the trail rehabilitation is finished.		in the area that will be closed. Alternative 7M outlines several standards for trail rehab and operations that guide activity in Bear Canyon which must be met prior to opening these routes to motorized use. We believe with these efforts, increased OHV Ranger patrols, and an intensified information and education program that this trail system can accommodate motorized users and provide a valuable 1/2 or evening ride opportunity close to Bozeman while still protecting important resource values. Future use will be monitored to ensure the measures are effective.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We support a more balanced approach to recreational travel in Bear Canyon. The upper reaches of the canyon provide good cross-country skiing opportunities, combining rare gentle terrain with decent snow conditions. The loop on Trail #440 is a great day long ski trip. The majority of users, current and potential, are non-motorized.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M would manage the lower portion of Bear Canyon as a dedicated ski trail - from the Bear Canyon Trailhead to the 440 trail junction. This lower stretch of the Canyon is very popular with xc skiers and snowshoeing. Winter motorized access would be provided from the Goose Creek Trailhead. We believe with the winter non-motorized opportunities proposed to be provided in New World Gulch, Bozeman Creek and Hyalite that this area provides a valuable snowmobile opportunity for short rides close to Bozeman, but that access in most appropriate from the Goose Creek Trailhead.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		Trail #53 Bear Lakes leads directly to the Bear/Mystic divide. It is open to snowmobiling in all alternatives, even though this makes trespass by snowmobilers into the Mystic Lake/Bozeman Creek area all too easy.	Bear Canyon	This area is currently open to snowmobiling, and there is not a history of significant snowmobile trespass into Mystic Lake/Bozeman Creek. The route across the divide is challenging (steep side slope and timber covered) and provides a disincentive to most riders attempting to cross the divide into the closed area.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		There also needs to be a closure to snowmobiles on the east side of Chestnut to save popular and accessible backcountry ski terrain for skiers and avoid growing user conflict. In addition, a proposed land swap and trail access from Interstate 90 (the Schmidt exchange) would facilitate and enhance non motorized recreation on Chestnut Mountain, one of the least-appreciated areas of public land close to Bozeman. It would be a shame if this exchange and trail system were to be completed only to have Chestnut overrun with motorized vehicles.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M would manage the lower portion of Bear Canyon as a dedicated ski trail - from the Bear Canyon Trailhead to the 440 trail junction. This lower stretch of the Canyon is very popular with xc skiers and for snowshoeing. Winter motorized access would be provided from the Goose Creek Trailhead. We believe with the winter non-motorized opportunities proposed to be provided in New World Gulch, Bozeman Creek and Hyalite that this area provides a valuable snowmobile opportunity for short rides close to Bozeman. We recognize that Chestnut Mountain is popular with backcountry skiers, but in order to provide an equitable mix of winter opportunities close to Bozeman we felt it best to preserve the established snowmobiling

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						opportunity in Bear Canyon.
Robb Goodell		663		New World gulch - serious conflict with skiers, snowshoers and there are a lot of skiers these days. Snowmobiles can access at Trail Creek Trailhead and stay in the upper basin (by Older Cooper Reservoir).	Bear Canyon	The New World Gulch and Moonshine Trails are proposed to be managed as non-motorized year long in alternative 7M. Alternative 7M would provide access to the upper Bear Canyon drainage from the Goose Creek TH - providing a dedicated ski trail in the lower portion of the canyon from the Bear Canyon Trailhead.
Thomas B. Wells		553		Bear Lakes Trail #53 - This trail should be closed to motorized. There is a front range hut-to-hut ski route possibility that is not compatible with snowmobiles. Ski into Trail Creek the first day, then over the divide on the second day to Mystic Lake.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M would manage the lower portion of Bear Canyon as a dedicated ski trail - from the Bear Canyon Trailhead to the 440 trail junction. This lower stretch of the Canyon is very popular with xc skiers and for snowshoeing. Winter motorized access would be provided from the Goose Creek Trailhead. We believe with the winter non-motorized opportunities proposed to be provided in New World Gulch, Bozeman Creek and Hyalite that this area provides a valuable snowmobile opportunity for short rides close to Bozeman, but that access in most appropriate from the Goose Creek Trailhead.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 440 & 53 - Bear Canyon - Motorized - Summer and winter - leave open - this is close to Bozeman, has a lake and wildlife to watch, trail is a loop (great) for bike or motorcycles.	Bear Canyon	The preferred alternative would manage trail 440 and 53 to Bear Lakes as open to summer and winter motorized use, with seasonal restrictions. These routes would not be open to motorized use until trail reconstruction and restoration was completed to address unacceptable resource damage.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 436 - Hood Lick, Trail 440 - Bear Loop, Trail 456 - Wildhorse, Trail 457 - Horse Lick, Trail 458 - Chestnut Mountain - Motorized - Leave open - Summer and Winter - Family, fun, camping, fishing, view.	Bear Canyon	All of these routes would be managed in alternative 7M as summer motorized routes (ATV's and motorcycles) with seasonal restrictions except for trail 458- Chestnut mountain. This route would be closed to summer motorized to protect an important wildlife migration corridor.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	Another way to provide more ski terrain is to dedicate Bear Canyon to skiers and ban snowmobiles from the entire drainage. The loss of Bear Canyon should not be significant; there are still thousands of acres for snowmobile use around Bozeman -- 14,000 acres in the Bangtails, 600 acres around Fairy lake, and 56,000 in the Gallatin Roaded area around Little Bear Creek.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M would manage the lower portion of Bear Canyon as a dedicated ski trail - from the Bear Canyon Trailhead to the 440 trail junction. This lower stretch of the Canyon is very popular with xc skiers and for snowshoeing. Winter motorized access would be provided from the Goose Creek Trailhead. We believe with the winter non-motorized opportunities proposed to be provided in New World Gulch, Bozeman Creek and Hyalite that this area provides a valuable snowmobile opportunity for short rides close to Bozeman, but that access in most appropriate from the Goose Creek

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Trailhead.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	Allowing snowmobiles use of other good ski area on plowed road, such as Bear Canyon, may be justified as compensation for the snowmobile prohibitions at Hyalite.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M would manage the lower portion of Bear Canyon as a dedicated ski trail - from the Bear Canyon Trailhead to the 440 trail junction. This lower stretch of the Canyon is very popular with xc skiers and for snowshoeing. Winter motorized access would be provided from the Goose Creek Trailhead. We believe with the winter non-motorized opportunities proposed to be provided in New World Gulch, Bozeman Creek and Hyalite that this area provides a valuable snowmobile opportunity for short rides close to Bozeman, but that access in most appropriate from the Goose Creek Trailhead.
Amanda Carter		132	Bozeman	I'd suggest making the Bear Canyon access up to the foot bridge non motorized. It would allow easy family recreation from Bozeman. Snowmobiles could access from Goose Creek or trail Creek.	Bear Canyon	Alternative 7M would manage the lower portion of Bear Canyon as a dedicated ski trail - from the Bear Canyon Trailhead to the 440 trail junction. This lower stretch of the Canyon is very popular with xc skiers and for snowshoeing. Winter motorized access would be provided from the Goose Creek Trailhead. We believe with the winter non-motorized opportunities proposed to be provided in New World Gulch, Bozeman Creek and Hyalite that this area provides a valuable snowmobile opportunity for short rides close to Bozeman, but that access in most appropriate from the Goose Creek Trailhead.
Kerry White		1616		Sphinx Mountain is a special place for me in the winter. Redirect trail 8 around section 9 and keep this area open to motorized. Take the temporary closure off, at least for winter use. This closure is unfounded. Make the wilderness boundary highly visible. I know motorized users will help with signage and enforcement. The loop of 10 to 174 to 6 is a good one or 10 to 174 to 6 to 30 to 33 to 6 to 10 is also good.	Big Sky	Sphinx Mountain is in the Lee Metcalf Wilderness on the Beaverhead-Deerlodge NF where snowmobiles and all motorized or mechanized use is prohibited by law. The Inspiration Ridge Trail thru section 8 also goes in and out of the Lee Metcalf Wilderness and is closed to all motorized use. Trails 30 and 33 are currently in a closed area to snowmobiles and would remain so in the preferred alternative to protect important big game winter range. The preferred alternative (7M) would allow snowmobile travel on trails 10 and 174 after December 1. Posting of the Wilderness boundary in this area has been a priority for many years, and will continue to be in the future.
George F. Hoffman		1335	Belgrade	I ask that I'd not be made to have my snowmobile experience curtailed in the MacAttee Basin area. I have never witnessed the incursions from myself or fellow writers into the Lee Metcalf Wilderness area.	Big Sky	McAttee Basin is located on the Beaverhead Deerlodge NF and is outside the scope of this decision.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Additional signage, however, would help prevent accidental incursions.		
Patricia Brandon		739		The Inspiration Trail Divide #8 and these 2nd Yellow Mule trail 42 need to remain open for motorcycles as a loop trail. These are nice rides with beautiful views that should be enjoyed by motorcyclists.	Big Sky	The Inspiration Divide trail swings in and out of the Lee Metcalf Wilderness - and is therefore legally closed to motorized use by virtue of the wilderness designation. In the preferred alternative 7M - Second Yellowmule #42 would be managed for foot, horse and mountain bike traffic only. However - a large loop trail is proposed which would include the Buck Ridge Trail, portions of First and Third Yellowmule trails and a connector between them which would provide a high quality motorized opportunity accessing similar terrain to 2nd Yellowmule.
Joe Polus		1487		Leave the entire Big Sky Trail open to ATVs. This is a historic and very important motorized route on the GNF. Summer ATV users keep this route clear for winter snowmobile use.	Big Sky	Portions of the Big Sky Trail would be managed for ATV's - primarily in the Gallatin Roaded Travel Planning area under the preferred alternative. Where the Big Sky Trail crosses into the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area and into the Cabin Creek Wildlife and Recreation Management Area, the route will only be managed for motorcycle travel where it traverses existing trails (see the summer motorized maps). The Lee Metcalf Wilderness Act, and the Montana Wilderness Study Act compel use to maintain the wilderness character of these areas as they were when they were designated. This route was only used by single track motorcycles at that time, and will continue to be managed to provide that opportunity in the preferred alternative to ensure wilderness character is maintained.
Greg Beardslee		737		Lizard Lakes is not in any way inside the wilderness area. I would like to point out that this destination should remain open to mountain biking.	Big Sky	Trail 63 accessing Lizard Lakes from the Taylor Fork would be open to mountain bikes and motorcycles in the preferred alternative.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		Closure of trail #199, Elkhorn Ridge, to motorcycles would greatly improve non motorized travel opportunities in this area, allowing people from the rapidly growing Big Sky area more chance to experience solitude and wilderness, and creating a large motor free area for wildlife security, particularly elk.	Big Sky	Alternative 7M proposes to allow motorcycles to access trail 199 from July 15 - September 5. This route provides a popular loop trail route to Buffalo Horn Lake that has documented historic use that predates the Wilderness Study Designation. The rest of the year, this trail would be closed to wheeled motorized use - providing good opportunities for solitude in a more remote setting in spring/early summer and fall. The route is part of the Big Sky Snowmobile trail however, and would remain open to snowmobiles on a designated route through a closed area during winter, as it is today.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Loren Blanksma		1194		It is a very good idea to develop the Yellow Mule loop trail (157, 162) on the Buck Creek Ridge trail (10) to help compensate ATVS for trail opportunities lost in other areas.	Big Sky	Thank you for your comment. The loop route that was proposed in the DEIS remains the same in Alternative 7M- providing a quality ATV loop with scenic views.
Mark Pearson		959	Bozeman	Mount Ellis and Wheeler Mtn should be off limits to snowmobilers as these have become popular destinations for skiers.	Bozeman Creek	In all alternatives, Mount Ellis would be managed as "off limits" to snowmobiles on system routes. This area is State land and is closed to snowmobiles by the State. The north and east aspects of Wheeler Mountain would be closed to snowmobiles in Alternative 7M providing a non-motorized ski opportunity in the currently most popular slopes.
Noreen Breeding		1004	Bozeman	Leverich Canyon trail #435 should not be considered a ski trail b/c it is too steep to ski. There is no plowed access or parking in the winter.	Bozeman Creek	Leverich Canyon is not proposed as a ski trail in any alternative.
Noreen Breeding		454		New World Gulch Trail #50 from the trailhead to the national forest boundary is nonexistent in the winter. A new winter ski trail above the creek is needed and has been mentioned in plans by Brian McNeil.	Bozeman Creek	Alternative 7M proposed to manage the Moonshine Trail #50 as a designated ski and snowshoe trail. This is currently a popular route, even though it is challenging. This decision only addresses the appropriate use of routes, and does not address facility condition issues specifically. However, improvements to this route are not unlikely in the future, but must be coordinated with the State in that the historic National Forest Trail crosses several sections of State land in this area.
Noreen Breeding		454		Trail #538, Moonshine Gulch, is also a terrible ski trail, but a relatively nice hiking trail. Bicyclists are using this trail more frequently and they and horses should be excluded because it frequently crosses the creek. Moonshine Gulch should be preserved for hikers.	Bozeman Creek	Alternative 7M proposed to manage the Moonshine Trail #50 as a designated ski and snowshoe trail in winter and as a hiker/biker/stock trail in summer. This is currently a popular route, even though it is challenging. This decision only addresses the appropriate use of routes, and does not address facility condition issues specifically. However, improvements to this route are not unlikely in the future, but must be coordinated with the State in that the historic National Forest Trail crosses several sections of State land in this area.
Noreen Breeding		454		Leverich Canyon trail #435 should not be considered a ski trail because it is too steep to ski. There is no plowed access or parking in winter. In summer it connects to motorized route #3159 eliminating the possibility of links to other trails for hiking.	Bozeman Creek	Leverich Canyon is not proposed as a designated ski trail in any alternative.
Noreen Breeding		454		The proposed new ski loop in Bozeman Creek may be a good idea if it does not disturb wildlife. Ski trail grooming is not practical. Snowshoers, dog walkers, and runners, and the little snowcat used by the water treatment plant employees quickly obliterate any ski	Bozeman Creek	Alternatives 3 and 4 would manage a loop trail on the lower portion of this drainage. Alternative 7M would not construct and manage this loop route, primarily to mitigate conflicts with wintering moose. This route is currently groomed by the Forest Service, and has been

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				tracks. Grooming ruins the trail for backcountry skiers and may also draw skate skiers, increasing overcrowding.		for many years. Public sentiment and comment has been to maintain this area as a groomed route, which is what is proposed in Alternative 7M.
Noreen Breeding		454		A new winter connector ski trail that crosses the creek near the trailhead and climbs to join the nearest abandoned logging road extending from the Moser Creek area is a great idea. If the Forest laid out the trail, it can be cleared and maintained by volunteers as ski trails do not require a trail tread (the creek crossing could be removed for summer.)	Bozeman Creek	Thank you for your suggestion. This route was not considered in any alternatives - nor is the suggested connector route on National Forest. This suggestion is outside the scope of this decision.
Noreen Breeding		454		An error in the table for alt 7 allows snowmobile use on route #3160 even though snowmobiles are prohibited at the Hyalite end of the same road.	Bozeman Creek	Thank you for your comment. The table has been corrected in the FEIS to show that snowmobiles are prohibited on this route.
Sara Goulden		1757		Require that dogs be leashed on some heavily used trails to protect wildlife and water quality. This trail is frequented by moose and bear, yet recreationists allow their dogs to run at large. I have seen dogs chase and harass moose and other wildlife on this trail. The situation with the bears will sooner or later escalate and possibly result in injury to dog, human or bear.	Bozeman Creek	We understand your concerns about dogs in Bozeman Ck., however the travel plan decision only addresses the appropriate human use of roads and trails. Restricting dogs on specific routes or areas is outside the scope of this decision. Please contact the Bozeman District Ranger to discuss your concern.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	A new trail suitable for skiing is also needed in New World Gulch. The current hiking trail has many sections that are too steep and narrow for cross country skiing, and the trail packed out in the winter straight up the creek bottom is narrow and has many sharp turns and short steep places.	Bozeman Creek	Alternative 7M proposed to manage the Moonshine Trail #50 as a designated ski and snowshoe trail. This is currently a popular route, even though it is challenging. This decision only addresses the appropriate use of routes, and does not address facility condition issues specifically. However, improvements to this route are not unlikely in the future, but must be coordinated with the State in that the historic National Forest Trail crosses several sections of State land in this area.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	For Moser route # 3160, Alternative 6, which prohibits ATVs and motorcycles, is preferred to alternative 7 because route #3160 connects to non-motorized Bozeman Creek Area.	Bozeman Creek	Alternative 7M would manage an ATV loop that straddles the Bozeman Creek/Hyalite divide on road #3160. This trail is confined to a loop that does not connect to any of the non-motorized routes where hiking is emphasized in Bozeman Creek. Alternative 7M would provide quality non-motorized opportunities in the bulk of Bozeman Creek.
Gary Vodehnal	GVLT	815		,,,thinking about the possibilities of creating a bike able complex of loop trails within riding distance from Bozeman, utilizing existing trails, logging roads and new trails. An area that looks quite promising is on the divide between Bozeman Creek and Hyalite Creek. It would be bounded on the Northwest by	Bozeman Creek	These suggestions have merit but unfortunately it is too late to consider them within this round of travel planning. In that we were unaware of this proposal prior to analyzing options in the DEIS, we were unable present them for public comment, which is necessary prior to completing the project and rendering a decision.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Hodgeman Canyon and Leverich Creek, with Moser Creek to the southeast. Forest Service Roads in the area include; FS 3158, 3159 E, F, and R, 3161 C and A, 3166, 1761 A and B. The area is accessible from Bozeman via the Bozeman Creek Trail and the Leverich Canyon Trail. Several connections could be made from the Hyalite Creek Drainage.		However this does not mean that the opportunities are lost for the future. It may be possible to evaluate these through amendment of the travel plan in the future. The commenter is urged to contact the Bozeman District Ranger to further refine these ideas over the next few years.
Bill Hopkins		1019	Bozeman	I support the Backcountry Skier proposal for the Bridger Range. The Travel Plan should consider the combined effects of Bridger Bowl expansion and motorized use have on shrinking opportunities for backcountry skiers in the Bridgers.	Bridger Canyon	Alternative 7M would adopt much of the backcountry skier proposal in combination with suggestions from Montana Department of Fish Wildlife and Parks relative to important mountain goat winter range.
Joe Cashman	Cashman Nursery	43	Bozeman	Closing the Bridgers to snowmobiles and at the same time allowing Bridger Bowl expand is irrational. Building new ski lifts and roads has a much greater environmental impact than riding a snowmobile on top of the snow.	Bridger Canyon	During the analysis for the expansion of Bridger Bowl, mitigation was identified to offset losses in key winter wildlife habitat which included prohibiting snowmobiles in the South Fork of Brackett Creek. This mitigation was necessary to protect key habitat elsewhere in the Bridgers in light of the Bridger Bowl expansion.
Todd Hoitsma		1340	Bozeman	Ski Access in the Bridgers: Snowmobile free areas need to be set aside for backcountry skiers. With the approval of the Bridger bowl expansion is a matter of time before foot powered (and non-Bridger Bowl paying) backcountry (BC) skiers are shut out of two of our most favorite places: Bradley Meadows, as well as Slushman's drainage (even considering if Bridger " lowers the gates" on the same backcountry access).	Bridger Canyon	Alternative 7M proposes to manage the South and Middle Forks of Brackett Creek, and the Bridger Ridge from the southern tip above the "M" north to pass between Hard Scrabble and Sacajewa as closed to snowmobiles. An additional closure area from the Frazier divide north to Flathead Pass is also included in this proposed non-motorized winter recreation area. See the Alternative 7M winter map.
Jean MacInnes	Bohart Ranch Cross-Country Ski Center	760	Bozeman	The preferred alternative for Bridger Canyon, the Bangtail's, and north to Fairy Lake is acceptable. The emphasis for non-motorized travel in the Bridger Canyon section and parts of the Bangtail area are appreciated. Keeping the motorized travel to the north towards The Fairy Lake is helpful to what we at Bohart emphasize, which is nonmotorized trail use, including walking, running, mountain biking and horseback riding in the summer and of course the cross-country skiing in the winter.	Bridger Canyon	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 7M would maintain the configuration you describe as acceptable. Please see the winter map for alternative 7M.
John Preston		767	Bozeman	The upcoming expansion of Bridger Bowl will further limited backcountry skier access in the Bridgers. Skiers and high in marking snowmobilers need to be separated because riders can totally "consume" slopes in an amazing short amount of time, not to mention the noise impact they have on other	Bridger Canyon	Alternative 7M proposes to manage the South and Middle Forks of Brackett Creek, and the Bridger Ridge from the southern tip above the "M" north to pass between Hard Scrabble and Sacajewa as closed to snowmobiles. An additional closure area from the Frazier divide north to Flathead Pass is also included in

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				recreationist. I would like to see snowmobilers restricted to existing roads in the North Bridgers, especially the Flat Irons. wildlife, including wolverine and lynx populations, would also benefit from this restriction.		this proposed non-motorized winter recreation area. See the Alternative 7M winter map.
Scott M. Hancock		653		The cross-country skiing on the east side of the Bridgers has been seriously degraded from the S. Fork Brackett Creek north to the Frazier Basin by the encroachment of more high-powered snow machines. Important moose and wolverine habitat exists there, and some significant east Bridger motorfree block of land needs to be designated for wildlife and quiet recreational purposes.	Bridger Canyon	Alternative 7M proposes to manage the South and Middle Forks of Brackett Creek, and the Bridger Ridge from the southern tip above the "M" north to pass between Hard Scrabble and Sacajewa as closed to snowmobiles. An additional closure area from the Frazier divide north to Flathead Pass is also included in this proposed non-motorized winter recreation area. See the Alternative 7M winter map.
Thomas B. Wells		553		Goal 2(1) and Objective 2(2) sound good but are too modest. One or two of marked cross-country ski trails is not a meaningful mileage. Cross country skiers, on the appropriate terrain, will use many miles of terrain, groomed or not as Bozeman Creek proves, as long as they are not in conflict with snowmobiles. Please adopt a policy of extensive marked but not groomed trails in order to further quiet use in this area.	Bridger Canyon	Alternative 7M proposes to manage marked ski trails on the S. Fk. and Middle Forks off Brackett Creek. While recreation objectives would have been better met by providing additional mileage of marked ski trails in the travel planning area (as in alternatives 3 and 4) conflicts arose with direction relative to adding additional marked or groomed routes in lynx habitat (see the effects analysis in chapter 3 of the FEIS for Lynx). The configuration outlined in Alternative 7M provides high quality marked route opportunities while meeting lynx habitat management objectives.
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		SEE MAP BC Skier Area A - this area around Ross Pass includes places called "The Playground", "Texas Bowl", and "Wolverine Bowl". After the Bridger Bowl expansion, and given the addition of a "low gate" allowing skiers to leave the area well below the ridge, this area will be accessible from the ski area. In our suggested plan, access would be by foot via a 3-mile long road roughly following the S. Fork of Brackett Creek.	Bridger Canyon	Thank you for your comments and the efforts you made to work with skiers and snowmobilers to create the backcountry skiers proposal for snowmobile and ski access management in the Bridgers. Your comments and proposal for management were used to fine tune the open snowmobile areas, as was input from other skiers, snowmobilers and Mt Fish Wildlife and Parks. The open snowmobile configuration displayed in Alternative 7M represents a combination of all of this input that provides both high quality dedicated ski opportunities as well as definable , challenge snowmobile opportunities in the Fairy Lake Area. We believe this proposed configuration addresses most of the concerns brought to us by the Bozeman Area Skiers (represented by Jay Pape).
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		SEE MAP BC Skier Area B- The Flatirons, the Big Bump, Valhalla bowl, Nayanooki Bowl (far too many names for such a small area here). This area represents the highest concentration of BC skier use in the	Bridger Canyon	Thank you for your comments and the efforts you made to work with skiers and snowmobilers to create the backcountry skiers proposal for snowmobile and ski access management in the Bridgers. Your comments and proposal for management were used to fine tune the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Bridgers. Peak 8382T is called the "Big Bump". The slopes to the east of this feature, and the slopes behind it on the main face of the Bridger Range all are heavily used by skiers. The gully to its north would be more heavily used if it were not usually tracked by snowmobiles. This is the area of greatest concern for Backcountry skiers in the Bridgers; it's mainly used by ski-bilers. Interestingly, the gully & bowl immediately south of the Big Bump are not used by skiers because of poor ski conditions.		open snowmobile areas, as was input from other skiers, snowmobilers and Mt Fish Wildlife and Parks. The open snowmobile configuration displayed in Alternative 7M represents a combination of all of this input that provides both high quality dedicated ski opportunities as well as definable , challenge snowmobile opportunities in the Fairy Lake Area. We believe this proposed configuration addresses most of the concerns brought to us by the Bozeman Area Skiers (represented by Jay Pape).
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		SEE MAP BC Skier Area C - Sacagawea Peak, the Great One is a historic ski run from the south summit of Sacagawea, and "Airplane bowl" is name given to the NE aspect of this peak (9581T).	Bridger Canyon	Thank you for your comments and the efforts you made to work with skiers and snowmobilers to create the backcountry skiers proposal for snowmobile and ski access management in the Bridgers. Your comments and proposal for management were used to fine tune the open snowmobile areas, as was input from other skiers, snowmobilers and Mt Fish Wildlife and Parks. The open snowmobile configuration displayed in Alternative 7M represents a combination of all of this input that provides both high quality dedicated ski opportunities as well as definable , challenge snowmobile opportunities in the Fairy Lake Area. We believe this proposed configuration addresses most of the concerns brought to us by the Bozeman Area Skiers (represented by Jay Pape).
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		SEE MAP BC Skier Area D - The east face of Hardscrabble Peak presents good but under-utilized skiing opportunities. While these slopes are naturally protected from snowmobile activity by thick timber and steep slopes, they are definitely in the soundscape of Fairy Lakes Basin. Marked but unlabelled-is an area in the Frazier Lake Basin which receives some use by ski-bilers when snow conditions permit.	Bridger Canyon	Thank you for your comments and the efforts you made to work with skiers and snowmobilers to create the backcountry skiers proposal for snowmobile and ski access management in the Bridgers. Your comments and proposal for management were used to fine tune the open snowmobile areas, as was input from other skiers, snowmobilers and Mt Fish Wildlife and Parks. The open snowmobile configuration displayed in Alternative 7M represents a combination of all of this input that provides both high quality dedicated ski opportunities as well as definable , challenge snowmobile opportunities in the Fairy Lake Area. We believe this proposed configuration addresses most of the concerns brought to us by the Bozeman Area Skiers (represented by Jay Pape).
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		SEE MAP Snowmobile Play Area - these are not identified on the map, except in general terms North and South; As skiers, we have seen heavy snowmobile use in the South area, in the 3 bowls just south of BC Ski	Bridger Canyon	Thank you for your comments and the efforts you made to work with skiers and snowmobilers to create the backcountry skiers proposal for snowmobile and ski access management in the Bridgers. Your comments and proposal for management were used to fine tune the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				area B. In the north area, near Fairy Lake, snowmobilers do not seem to go into the high country as much.		open snowmobile areas, as was input from other skiers, snowmobilers and Mt Fish Wildlife and Parks. The open snowmobile configuration displayed in Alternative 7M represents a combination of all of this input that provides both high quality dedicated ski opportunities as well as definable , challenge snowmobile opportunities in the Fairy Lake Area. We believe this proposed configuration addresses most of the concerns brought to us by the Bozeman Area Skiers (represented by Jay Pape).
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		Difficulty of Understanding Terrain - It seems easy for miscommunication to occur because of the difficulty of understanding the terrain. We think it is important for the FS Travel Planning personnel to have these play areas explained by those who visit them by whatever means, possibly including on the ground visits.	Bridger Canyon	Thank you for your comments and the efforts you made to work with skiers and snowmobilers to create the backcountry skiers proposal for snowmobile and ski access management in the Bridgers. Your comments and proposal for management were used to fine tune the open snowmobile areas, as was input from other skiers, snowmobilers and Mt Fish Wildlife and Parks. The open snowmobile configuration displayed in Alternative 7M represents a combination of all of this input that provides both high quality dedicated ski opportunities as well as definable , challenge snowmobile opportunities in the Fairy Lake Area. We believe this proposed configuration addresses most of the concerns brought to us by the Bozeman Area Skiers (represented by Jay Pape).
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		SEE MAP Boundaries - the boundaries separating these uses need to be identifiable terrain features, or impassable, or marked, in order to be effective.	Bridger Canyon	Thank you for your comments and the efforts you made to work with skiers and snowmobilers to create the backcountry skiers proposal for snowmobile and ski access management in the Bridgers. Your comments and proposal for management were used to fine tune the open snowmobile areas, as was input from other skiers, snowmobilers and Mt Fish Wildlife and Parks. The open snowmobile configuration displayed in Alternative 7M represents a combination of all of this input that provides both high quality dedicated ski opportunities as well as definable , challenge snowmobile opportunities in the Fairy Lake Area. We believe this proposed configuration addresses most of the concerns brought to us by the Bozeman Area Skiers (represented by Jay Pape).
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		SEE MAP Boundary #1Snowmobilers report that this boundary would be marked by a gully/creek system that would be easy to identify, and in many places impassable.	Bridger Canyon	Thank you for your comments and the efforts you made to work with skiers and snowmobilers to create the backcountry skiers proposal for snowmobile and ski access management in the Bridgers. Your comments and proposal for management were used to fine tune the open snowmobile areas, as was input from other skiers,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						snowmobilers and Mt Fish Wildlife and Parks. The open snowmobile configuration displayed in Alternative 7M represents a combination of all of this input that provides both high quality dedicated ski opportunities as well as definable , challenge snowmobile opportunities in the Fairy Lake Area. We believe this proposed configuration addresses most of the concerns brought to us by the Bozeman Area Skiers (represented by Jay Pape).
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		SEE MAP Boundary #2: This is at the northern edge of "Snowmobile play area - South" and the southern edge of "BC Ski area B". This boundary near the Bridger ridge is in steep terrain and couldn't be accessed. It would need to be marked in the saddle west of Pt 8382 (the "Big Bump"). Further down, terrain blocks passage as the boundary drops SE. Between the "B" in Boundary #1 and BM 6991T, some parts of the boundary would be impassable due to vegetation; others would need to be marked; however, a marked groomed snowmobile trail would be the best boundary marker: off trail travel would be allowed to the south of the groomed road, but not to the north.	Bridger Canyon	Thank you for your comments and the efforts you made to work with skiers and snowmobilers to create the backcountry skiers proposal for snowmobile and ski access management in the Bridgers. Your comments and proposal for management were used to fine tune the open snowmobile areas, as was input from other skiers, snowmobilers and Mt Fish Wildlife and Parks. The open snowmobile configuration displayed in Alternative 7M represents a combination of all of this input that provides both high quality dedicated ski opportunities as well as definable , challenge snowmobile opportunities in the Fairy Lake Area. We believe this proposed configuration addresses most of the concerns brought to us by the Bozeman Area Skiers (represented by Jay Pape).
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		SEE MAP Boundary #3: From the summit of Sacagawea, this boundary would be inaccessible until very near Fairy Lake. Marking would be necessary near Fairy Lake; but further east, terrain and vegetation would block passage by snowmobile.	Bridger Canyon	We concur with this comment. The proposed configuration in Alternative 7M relies on natural terrain features and logical boundaries to better define open snowmobile areas.
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		SEE MAP Boundary #4: This boundary would be impassable near the Bridger ridge; several saddles that connect the Fairy Lake Basin to the south with Frazier Basin to the north would need to be marked. Further east, boundary marking would be required until the terrain prevents access to the north by snowmachine.	Bridger Canyon	Thank you for your comments and the efforts you made to work with skiers and snowmobilers to create the backcountry skiers proposal for snowmobile and ski access management in the Bridgers. Your comments and proposal for management were used to fine tune the open snowmobile areas, as was input from other skiers, snowmobilers and Mt Fish Wildlife and Parks. The open snowmobile configuration displayed in Alternative 7M represents a combination of all of this input that provides both high quality dedicated ski opportunities as well as definable , challenge snowmobile opportunities in the Fairy Lake Area. We believe this proposed configuration addresses most of the concerns brought to us by the Bozeman Area Skiers (represented by Jay Pape).

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		A Timeshare Idea - There was discussion about a "time share" system, in which some areas would be open to snowmobiles on even numbered days, and closed on odd-numbered days, allowing quiet recreation on those days. Any timeshare system would have to include extensive core ski terrain in which off-route motorized travel was not allowed.	Bridger Canyon	The Forest is considering the time share concept for summer motorized and mountain bike use on some routes near Bozeman post implementation of the decision (see the ROD for more information). At this time, we did not feel compelled to consider time share for winter uses, but rather are relying on providing well distributed segregated opportunities close to communities to provide quality winter recreation experiences and mitigate user conflict.
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		Saddle Peak Access - Access to skiing on Saddle Peak has been from the Bridger Bowl parking lot, across Slushmans Peak. The Bridger Bowl expansion will alter this access. Backcountry skiers encourage the Gallatin Forest to pursue other legal accesses to this area. This increases opportunities for foot-accessed skiers (non-ski-bilers), and relieves use in the north.	Bridger Canyon	The preferred alternative identifies an access objective for acquiring perfected public access to Section 30 near the Bridger Bowl upper parking lot. This access would secure access for foot (ski) travel along the Slushman's road system below the Bridger Bowl Ski Area boundary to the common access route to the ridge south of Slushmans. See the Detailed Description of the Alternatives Objective B-3 and Table I-8 in this section.
Alan Oram		713	Bozeman	Access to Slushmans area and Saddle Peak - the area immediately south of Bridger Bowl ski area: Current access to this area is limited and tolerated via parking at Bridger and then through a corridor on private land to the forest boundary. With Bridger Bowls new expansion, access to this area should be guaranteed and not tied to Bridger in any way. Even if Bridger provides on area gate access, those of us who climb and ski in this part of the range will no longer have reasonable access. As well, there should be no motorized access at all.	Bridger Canyon	The preferred alternative identifies an access objective for acquiring perfected public access to Section 30 near the Bridger Bowl upper parking lot. This access would secure access for foot (ski) travel along the Slushman's road system below the Bridger Bowl Ski Area boundary to the common access route to the ridge south of Slushmans. See the Detailed Description of the Alternatives Objective B-3 and Table I-8 in this section. The entire southeastern portion of the Bridgers (south of the Middle Fork of Brackett Creek) is proposed to be managed for non-motorized winter recreation in the preferred alternative.
Alan Oram		713		North of Bridger Bowl Boundary: Access should be provided for backcountry skiers without having to travel through the ski area. Forest access bordering the ski area should be protected for non-motorized access.	Bridger Canyon	Access for areas north of Bridger Bowl Ski area would be provided on the S. Fk. Of Brackett Creek Road (also proposed to be a designated xc ski trail) in the preferred alternative. The entire southeastern portion of the Bridgers (south of the Middle Fork of Brackett Creek) is proposed to be managed for non-motorized winter recreation in the preferred alternative.
Alan Oram		713		In short I would like to limit snowmobile use to existing road only and no off road use in the area collectively known as the "Flatirons" as well as the area to the North in the basin beneath the East face of Sacagawea (this is also known as Naianukki bowl). Increased motorized use in the summer or winter needs to be limited to protect this resource as	Bridger Canyon	Thank you for your comment. A variety of comments from backcountry skiers, snowmobilers and MT Department of Fish Wildlife and Parks were considered when developing the snowmobile closure configuration in the Bridgers. Preserving high quality winter wildlife habitat, and backcountry skiing opportunities were significant components of the preferred alternative

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				well as the quality of the range.		configuration. In Alternative 7M - your suggestions are largely included - with a few open snowmobile areas in the Fairy Lake area and on lower elevation slopes. We felt this was a good compromise for both skiers and snowmobilers.
Alan Oram		713		I have found that the area to the south of Ross Pass has been a haven for skiing without the impact of snowmobiles. I would advocate that access to this area, which is not conducive to off road snowmobile use, be limited to on road access only.	Bridger Canyon	The entire southeastern portion of the Bridgers (south of the Middle Fork of Brackett Creek) is proposed to be managed for non-motorized winter recreation in the preferred alternative.
Peter Aengst		450	Bozeman	While I think most snowmobile use should be concentrated in the Bangtails, here is how I propose any changes to the travel plan be done. Moderate snowmobilers should have open most of the Bangtails and the road up North Brackett and Fairy Lake road and Flathead Pass road and spurs. Advanced/high mark snowmbilers should have some of the terrain from Fairy area. Backcountry skiers should have reserved to them (meaning no snowmobiling allowed) the area bounded by Bradley Meadow to Fairy Lake with everything uphill from the North Brackett road (or trail #500) all the way to the ridge closed to all snowmobiling. Nordic skiers should have south Brackett and Middle Brackett where they are closed to snowmobiling but ideally groomed once a week.	Bridger Canyon	Thank you for your comments and suggestions. The configuration you articulate is very similar to what is proposed in the preferred alternative. Please see the winter maps.
Libby Hancocle		1677	Bozeman	On the east side of the Bridger, I support motor-free designation from South Fork Brackett to Frazier Basin. This area is invaluable for winter access on skis and hiking in the other seasons. The parking lot at the forks is dangerous, overflowing and the fumes and noise pollution from snow machines is unnecessary at this junction with large parts of the forest open to them.	Bridger Canyon	As a result of the Brackett Creek land exchange (scheduled to be completed in late 2006) - the winter parking for snowmobile access would be moved from the Brackett Creek "Y" to Battle Ridge. In the preferred alternative, the marked snowmobile trails will begin at Battle Ridge and connect north to Flathead Pass. The entire southeastern portion of the Bridgers (south of the Middle Fork of Brackett Creek) is proposed to be managed for non-motorized winter recreation in the preferred alternative. Additionally - much of the steeper terrain from Ross Pass to Sacagewea would be managed for non-motorized uses.
Bruce Brock		1208		One thing that has worked well has been the use of the Brackett Creek area where skiers have used the southern part of the Brackett Creek drainage and snowmobilers the northern part. Signing concerning this would make it even more effective.	Bridger Canyon	This configuration is exactly what is proposed in the preferred alternative. Snowmobiling would be concentrated from the N. Fk. Of Brackett Ck. to Flathead pass, in the lower elevations. The entire southeastern portion of the Bridgers (south of the Middle Fork of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Brackett Creek) is proposed to be managed for non-motorized winter recreation in the preferred alternative. Additionally - much of the steeper terrain from Ross Pass to Sacagewea would be managed for non-motorized uses Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Patricia Dowd		1261		In an effort to balance wildlife, snowmobile and backcountry ski demands I support the backcountry skier proposal for the Bridgers. The proposal allows snowmobiles to use areas where they currently recreate and provides places for backcountry skiers to access the range-separate from snowmobiles.	Bridger Canyon	The information submitted by the backcountry skier group was very useful in developing the final winter configuration proposed for the Bridgers in the preferred alternative. These comments as well as input from other skiers, snowmobilers and Mt. Dept. Fish Wildlife and Parks helped fine tune the proposal in the DEIS to develop the preferred alternative which provides opportunities for both skiers and snowmobilers. See the winter map.
Patricia Dowd		1261		I encourage the FS to establish a place for cross-country skiing in the Bridgers. The south and Middle Brackett Creek areas south of Ross Pass is a perfect place.	Bridger Canyon	This configuration is exactly what is proposed in the preferred alternative. Snowmobiling would be concentrated from the N. Fk. Of Brackett Ck. to Flathead pass, in the lower elevations. The entire southeastern portion of the Bridgers (south of the Middle Fork of Brackett Creek) is proposed to be managed for non-motorized winter recreation in the preferred alternative. Additionally - much of the steeper terrain from Ross Pass to Sacagewea would be managed for non-motorized uses Please see the winter map.
Jim Earl		1264		It is important for the GNF to find alternative accesses to Saddle Peak and Bridger peak. As the ski area expands, the current public access to Saddle Peak will be lost and Slushman's Peak skiing will become incorporated into the ski area. Backcountry skiers believe that public access to Saddle Peak needs to be addressed in the Travel Plan	Bridger Canyon	The preferred alternative identifies an access objective for acquiring perfected public access to Section 30 near the Bridger Bowl upper parking lot. This access would secure access for foot (ski) travel along the Slushman's road system below the Bridger Bowl Ski Area boundary to the common access route to the ridge south of Slushmans. See the Detailed Description of the Alternatives Objective B-3 and Table I-8 in this section.
Todd Orr		840		525 - South Fork Brackett - manage as is for motorized use.	Bridger Canyon	The South Fork Brackett road was closed to motorized use during the Bridger Bowl Ski area analysis for winter activities- to provide mitigation for wintering wildlife. The travel plan preferred alternative would continue to manage this area as closed to motorized use in the winter. In the summer this route would be open to passenger cars, providing access to the Ross Pass Trailhead.
Todd Orr		840		538 - South Fork Brackett to Bridger Bowl - Suggest signing and managing as closed to motorized use to	Bridger Canyon	This configuration is exactly what is proposed in the preferred alternative. Snowmobiling would be

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				prevent access to a restricted area and unauthorized use of access roads to Bridger Bowl lifts and property.		concentrated from the N. Fk. Of Brackett Ck. to Flathead pass, in the lower elevations. The entire southeastern portion of the Bridgers (south of the Middle Fork of Brackett Creek) is proposed to be managed for non-motorized winter recreation in the preferred alternative. Additionally - much of the steeper terrain from Ross Pass to Sacagewea would be managed for non-motorized uses Please see the winter map.
Todd Orr		840		538 Bridger Bowl - Suggest signing and managing as closed to motorized use because of restricted area and unauthorized use of access roads to Bridger Bowl lifts and property.	Bridger Canyon	Trail #538 is proposed to be managed for non-motorized use both in summer and winter in the preferred alternative.
Amanda Carter		132	Bozeman	South Brackett trail should be closed to snowmobiles due to heavy X-C use. It's another ideal short day ski close to town and suitable for beginning skiers.	Bridger Canyon	The entire southeastern portion of the Bridgers (south of the Middle Fork of Brackett Creek) is proposed to be managed for non-motorized winter recreation in the preferred alternative.
Carl Krob		187	Bozeman	I strongly oppose closing the high country of Brackett Creek to snowmobiles.	Bridger Canyon	Thank you for your comment. We received many comments on the proposed open snowmobile configuration (both pro and con) during the comment period for the DEIS regarding this popular area. Our analysis showed that this area provided important habitat for wintering wildlife, as well as outstanding backcountry ski terrain. Concerns over motorized use and the effect on wintering wildlife and the popularity of this area for backcountry skiing compels us to propose much (not all) of the area to be managed for non-motorized winter recreation. An In the preferred alternative, an area near Fairy Lake to the ridge would be open to snowmobiling as would all of the lower elevation terrain north of the Middle Fork of Brackett Creek to Flathead Pass (see the winter map).
Amy McNamara		188	Bozeman	I think Brackett Creek area on the East side should be closed to snowmobiles to open up an area for cross county skiers.	Bridger Canyon	The entire southeastern portion of the Bridgers (south of the Middle Fork of Brackett Creek) is proposed to be managed for non-motorized winter recreation in the preferred alternative.
Alison Gidley		236	Livingston	Lastly I have concerns with some of the proposed snowmobile restrictions particularly the ones concerning the Bridgers and Middle Fork Brackett Creek trail. These trails are used both by skiers on snowmobiles accessing the backcountry terrain as well as by recreational snowmobilers. I realize that cross-country skiers want to restrict this area to snowmobiles but they have over 25km of groomed	Bridger Canyon	The Forest considered many comments provided by both skiers, snowmobilers and skiers that access the Brackett Creek area via snowmobiles in fine tuning the proposed action developed for the DEIS. Our preferred alternative in the FEIS recognizes the importance of snowmobile access to the base of slopes that skiers enjoy - and would provide that access from the Battle Ridge/N. Fk. of Brackett trail system, and an open area

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				trails less than a mile down the road at Bohart Ranch and miles of neighboring roads that are not used by snowmobiles. A snowmobile closure on the Middle Fork of Brackett Creek would dramatically reduce backcountry ski terrain in the Bridger Mountains. I do not see the need for changing the way Hyalite Reservoir road is managed, plowing it would not be in the best interest of the watershed or the users.		near Fairy Lake (see the winter maps). The sort of opportunities provided at Bohart are for track skiing only and it is a private fee opportunity. The use in this part of the Bridgers is by backcountry alpine skiers seeking steep challenging terrain off of groomed routes. Our recreation analysis delighted a significant shortage of family friendly- front country skiing opportunities close to Bozeman. Plowing the Hyalite road was proposed in the DEIS and is also in the preferred alternative in the FEIS to improve access to that sort of terrain and trails close to Bozeman. This proposal was overwhelmingly supported by commenters. The watershed analysis shows no negative effect from plowing the road. See the watershed effects analysis in Chapter 3 of the FEIS.
Kerry White		1616		Trails 205, 207, 210, 232, 90, 236, 208, 89, and 206 are adopted by the county as open to motorized and should remain that way. Trails 218, 216, 215 and 217 are adopted by the county as open to motorized and should also remain that way. West Yellowstone relies on motorized especially in winter to sustain their economy and this use should be protected.	Cabin Creek	The Forest Service has jurisdiction and management responsibility for all National Forest System trails and roads on the Gallatin National Forest. The Forest Service has no information or evidence to indicate that Gallatin County has asserted rights to these or to any other National Forest System trail or road on the Gallatin National Forest. The preferred alternative in the FEIS recognizes the importance of winter recreation to West Yellowstone, and doesn't propose any substantive changes from current opportunities.
Pat Simmons	Sierra Club	1545		Cabin Creek WMA - Under Alt 7 all roads and trails are open to snowmobile use. That needs to be relooked at and managed in accordance with the principles of public law 98-140 and its mandate to protect wildlife.	Cabin Creek	The legislative record shows that the Cabin Creek Wildlife Management Area was created instead of wilderness designation specifically to allow for an established backcountry snowmobile use. Wildlife effects analysis indicate that continued snowmobile use is compatible with wildlife objectives in the area. See the general wildlife issue in Chapter III of the FEIS.
Paul D. Herbel		1330		The Cabin Creek area needs to open and close at the same dates for all the trails in that area. Currently, you have trail #203 open July 15 to Sept 15 and #206 open July 15 - Oct 15. Make it all June 15 to Oct 15 (16 weeks at least) to maintain continuity and reduce confusion.	Cabin Creek	Alternative 7M proposes a more consistent seasonal restriction scenario for the Cabin Creek area. All motorcycle trails within the area would be open from July 15 - October 15. All ATV trails would be open from July 15 - Dec. 2 (this just includes two short segments of trail along the Skyline Trail from the Tepee Ck. Trailhead to the Cabin Creek Divide, and on the Red Cub Trail from the Potemogeton Trailhead to the Axolotl Lake Area). ATV access on these routes would facilitate access during hunting season into Cabin Creek.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Minnie Wapiti trail 203 and Red Cub Trail 205: the proposed opening date for this trail is July 15 this	Cabin Creek	Thank you for your comment. The current restrictions within the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				day is too late in the season. In most previous years this trail has been dry and usable for all forms of travel months earlier. Opening and closing dates are too restrictive.		Management area do not allow motor vehicle access before July 15, nor would the preferred alternative in the FEIS. This is to provide secure wildlife habitat during critical spring periods and protect trail facilities in an area of very sensitive soils. The motorcycle trails would be open from 7/15 through 10/15 to provide access during bird and bow seasons to this area.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Cabin Creek Divide: same explanation as for trails 203 in 205. Opening and closing dates to restrictive	Cabin Creek	Thank you for your comment. The current restrictions within the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management area do not allow motor vehicle access before July 15, nor would the preferred alternative in the FEIS. This is to provide secure wildlife habitat during critical spring periods and protect trail facilities in an area of very sensitive soils. The motorcycle trails would be open from 7/15 through 10/15 to provide access during bird and bow seasons to this area.
Mike Cannon		498	Helena	Under Alt. 7 most trails in the Cabin Creek/Beaver Creek area would be closed to the use of livestock from April 1 to June 15. I oppose the closure of these trails during that time period for the following reasons: 1) Travel by foot and horseback is a traditional use with minimal impact. 2) The closure period is during Montana fishing and spring bear seasons and would adversely affect travel by individuals and outfitters. 3) A general closure to stock animals in not warranted without specific data showing that travel by stock during April 1 to June 15 causes unacceptable damage to the resources.	Cabin Creek	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II in The Description of Alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		The current forest plan excludes vehicles over 40 inches in width to use Cabin Creek. This clear standard should remain in place in the travel plan as there is no record of any forest plan amendment to remove it. Therefore, ATV use should not be allowed within Cabin Creek.	Cabin Creek	Today, a 40" width limitation would be narrower than the industry standard and would effectively restrict trail use to motorcycles only. Therefore rather than considering adoption of the old width standard, the alternatives vary on the amount of trail that would be open or closed to ATV use. Additionally - the 40" standard currently stated in the Forest Plan for MA 20 is proposed to
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		We believe that the motorized uses proposed in the travel plan are not compatible with the protection and propagation of wildlife as intended by the Lee Metcalf Wilderness Act. The proposal to continue to allow ATVs on the Oil Well Trail (68) beyond the Cabin Creek boundary is not consistent with the Act or with the current forest plan. Oil Well Trail changes from open to close at the midpoint of the route, and	Cabin Creek	ATV's would be allowed on the Oil Well road Trail #68 up to it's junction with trail #203 and on Trail #203 from this junction to Pika Point. This was to provide a high-quality recreational opportunity for ATV users in a larger area where such opportunities were substantially reduced relative to the current conditions. Pika Point was selected as the end point for ATV use on this trail because it is a definable landscape feature and the trail

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				makes enforcement practically impossible on this trail.		north of this point is not conducive to ATV use due to vegetation and topography. The Oil Well Road Trail #68 and a portion of Trail #203 are trails where ATV use is consistent with the legislation establishing the Cabin Ck. Recreation and Wildlife Management Area (see Roadless Issue in FEIS.) Through adequate signing along with continued monitoring and enforcement, compliance with travel restrictions in this area would be acceptable. The Forest Service would continue to have the discretion to make travel changes addressing site-specific resource concerns as they arise.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		While snowmobiling is allowed by the Act we strongly support a snowmobile season limited to January 1 through March 15.	Cabin Creek	Alternative 5 would impose a December 1 to March 15 season of use in the Cabin Creek area. Alternative 7M would not impose a defined season of use. No overriding resource conflicts were identified during analysis which would compel a restricted snowmobile season.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		The current forest plan excludes vehicles over 40 inches in width to use Cabin Creek. This clear standard should remain in place in the travel plan as there is no record of any forest plan amendment to remove it. Therefore, ATV use should not be allowed within Cabin Creek.	Cabin Creek	Today, a 40" width limitation would be narrower than the industry standard and would effectively restrict trail use to motorcycles only. Therefore rather than considering adoption of the old width standard, the alternatives vary on the amount of trail that would be open or closed to ATV use. Additionally - the 40" standard currently stated in the Forest Plan for MA 20 is proposed to
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		We believe that the motorized uses proposed in the travel plan are not compatible with the protection and propagation of wildlife as intended by the Lee Metcalf Wilderness Act. The proposal to continue to allow ATVs on the Oil Well Trail (68) beyond the Cabin Creek boundary is not consistent with the Act or with the current forest plan. Oil Well Trail changes from open to close at the midpoint of the route, and makes enforcement practically impossible on this trail.	Cabin Creek	Alternative 7M ATV's would be allowed on the Oil Well road Trail #68 up to it's junction with trail #203 and on Trail #203 from this junction to Pika Point. This was to provide a high-quality recreational opportunity for ATV users in a larger area where such opportunities were substantially reduced relative to the current conditions. Pika Point was selected as the end point for ATV use on this trail because it is a definable landscape feature and the trail north of this point is not conducive to ATV use due to vegetation and topography. The Oil Well Road Trail #68 and a portion of Trail #203 are trails where ATV use is consistent with the legislation establishing the Cabin Ck. Recreation and Wildlife Management Area (see Roadless Issue in FEIS.) Through adequate signing along with continued monitoring and enforcement, compliance with travel restrictions in this area would be acceptable. The Forest Service would continue to have the discretion to make travel changes addressing site-specific resource concerns as they arise.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Donald Lovely		758		One of the loop rides we always enjoy is going up Kirkwood, through Cabin Creek then back to the highway via Red Canyon. I presume these closures are related to the grizzly bear habitat. I believe these closures are unwarranted. The September 15 closure of access to prize bird hunters and archers to use motorcycles for access during the major portion of their hunting seasons. I believe a plan wide date of October 15 would be more reasonable.	Cabin Creek	Alternative 7M would designate Kirkwood and Red Canyon open to motorcycles. The seasonal restrictions proposed in Alternative 7M would allow motorcycle travel on these open routes from July 15 - October 15, providing access for over 6 weeks during bird hunting and bow hunting season.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Summer motorized recreation in Cabin Creek: we don't understand the distinction between ATV and motorcycle use. We haven't noticed ATV or motorcycle use to be overwhelming in this area, nor is it at a level that causes any critical problems to wildlife. You may be penalizing a single user group for a questionable gain.	Cabin Creek	The Lee Metcalf Wilderness Act (PL 98-140) articulated for the Cabin Ck. Recreation and Wildlife Management Area that the area be managed to "maintain presently existing wilderness character". Conversion of routes that were single track (all routes in the Cabin Ck. WMA except the Oil Well Road - Trail # 68) to double track ATV routes would have tangible effects to wilderness character circa 1983. See the roadless effects analysis in Chapter III in the FEIS.
Joe Polus		1487		Mini Wapiti Trail #203 & other trails in the area (#s 205 and 206) are slated for open to motorcycle use on July 15 and close on September 15. We request these trails be opened a month earlier and closed a month later (June 15 - Oct. 15).	Cabin Creek	The seasonal restrictions proposed in Alternative 7M would allow motorcycle travel on these open routes from July 15 - October 15, providing access for over 6 weeks during bird hunting and bow hunting season. This area has very sensitive soils that are subject to more damage and erosion early in the season - therefore the preferred alternative would continue the existing open dates of July 15.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		We strongly favor a snowmobile season limited to the period January 1 - March 31 for the Cabin Creek WMA. In addition, monitoring should be performed within the WMA to determine the impacts of intensive snowmobile use in places like Carrot Basin.	Cabin Creek	The legislative record shows that the Cabin Creek Wildlife Management Area was created instead of wilderness designation specifically to allow for an established backcountry snowmobile use. Wildlife effects analysis indicate that continued snowmobile use is compatible with wildlife objectives in the area. See the general wildlife issue in Chapter III of the FEIS.
Tom Weiss		646	Helena	The Montana spring black bear season is open until June 15, plus the fishing season opens in mid-May. This is a unique time of year to observe wildlife and the spring green-up in a quiet setting. I have observed only a very few horse users in this area in the spring. The horse impact is minimal to this area in the spring. I have observed over 150 elk walking single file on trail #205 from Cub Creek into Cabin Creek on many occasions. To not allow a person to lead a pack horse over this same route that these elk	Cabin Creek	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II in The Description of Alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				just traveled does not have any logical rationale.		
Noreen Breeding		454		To better manage the Cabin Creek WMA, ATV traffic should be prohibited, motorcycle traffic should be limited to trail #203 from Beaver Creek Trailhead, and snowmobile travel should be restricted to the Big Sky trail with off trail travel prohibited.	Cabin Creek	in alternative 7M ATV's would be allowed on the Oil Well road Trail #68 up to it's with trail #203 and on Trail #203 from this junction to Pika Point. This was to provide a high-quality recreational opportunity for ATV users in a larger area where such opportunities were substantially reduced relative to the current conditions. Pika Point was selected as the end point for ATV use on this trail because it is a definable landscape feature and the trail north of this point is not conducive to ATV use due to vegetation and topography. The Oil Well Road Trail #68 and a portion of Trail #203 are trails where ATV use is consistent with the legislation establishing the Cabin Ck. Recreation and Wildlife Management Area (see Roadless Issue in FEIS.) Through adequate signing along with continued monitoring and enforcement, compliance with travel restrictions in this area would be acceptable. The Forest Service would continue to have the discretion to make travel changes addressing site-specific resource concerns as they arise.
Ted Lange		1094		One trail that is flagged for mt bike closure that Would possibly like to see left open is TR405 to the Wilderness boundary near Cherry Lake. Because of the length and difficulty of this ride, the number of people who would actually do it would be tiny. So if TR405 is at all rideable, please consider keeping it open.	Cherry Creek	Thank you for your comment. We did consider keeping this route open in alternatives 1 and 2. In the preferred alternative we felt that due to the limited opportunity and limited number of riders that providing the loop options on trails 401, and 406 provided a better quality ride, with less potential conflicts for wilderness trespass.
Paul D. Herbel		1330		Cherry Creek trail #401 needs to be open June 15 to Oct 15, not June 15 to Sept 15. This is a little used trail that provides no loop opportunity and is right next to a wilderness.	Cherry Creek	Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on trail 401 from 6/15 to 9/15. The fall restriction was included in this alternative to provide quality non-motorized hunting opportunities in the area and to improve wildlife habitat security in the fall. There has been continued discussion about the management of this trail as of the time of this comment response. Please see the ROD and Detailed Description of the Decision regarding the management of the Cherry Creek Trail #401.
Greg Beardslee		737		Cherry Lake Spur: the two trails leading up to the wilderness boundary come tantalizingly close to the lake, and really would be rewarding to peddle up if only the wilderness boundary at the lake was signed. We feel that the Cherry Lake spur trails are a special case where bikes should be allowed. This would not	Cherry Creek	Thank you for your comment. We did consider keeping this route open in alternatives 1 and 2. In the preferred alternative we felt that due to the limited opportunity and limited number of riders that providing the loop options on trails 401, and 406 provided a better quality ride, with less potential conflicts for wilderness trespass.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				be abused, not many people can peddle back that far, or even think about this ride Please don't insult us by closing these trails, 95% of which are not in the wilderness.		
Todd Orr		840		401 - Cherry Creek Trail - Suggest managing as open to motorcycle use or implement alternating day motorcycle use to reduce possible conflicts and satisfy both non and motorized groups. These longer trails are important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride.	Cherry Creek	Alternatives 1-3 and 7M would allow motorcycles on the 401 trail. There has been continued discussion about the management of this trail as of the time of this comment response. Please see the ROD and Detailed Description of the Decision regarding the management of the Cherry Creek Trail #401.
Todd Orr		840		419 - Cherry Cabin south - suggest managing as open to motorcycle use. Post signs as Wilderness boundary.	Cherry Creek	There is no trail 419 in the Cherry Creek area. The trail that leads south of the Cherry Creek Cabin is trail 413, and leads to the wilderness boundary. It is currently closed and is not considered for motorized use in any alternative to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities in this area, and prevent wilderness trespass.
trish Kerby		145		Please try to keep this area open it’s a lovely place to camp/hike/ ride ATV and hunt	Cherry Creek	The Cherry Creek Trail systems are not currently open to ATV's per the Montana Dakota OHV decision, nor was ATV access considered in order to maintain the primitive recreation opportunities in this area. Access would be provided via foot and horse travel in all alternatives, and by motorcycle in alternatives 1-3, and 7M. Please see the ROD for current information on Trail 401.
Paul Herbel		927	Bozeman	Cherry Creek trail #401 needs to be open 6/15 to 10/15, not 6/15 to 9/15. This is a little used trail that provides no loop opportunity and is right next to a wilderness area	Cherry Creek	Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on trail 401 from 6/15 to 9/15 provide quality non-motorized hunting opportunities in the area in the fall. Please see the ROD for new information on management of the Cherry Creek Trail #401.
Russell L. Miller	Turner Enterprises	836	Bozeman	Use, the TMP acknowledges (Chapter III-9) "very little" use of the 401 Trail by motorcycles. Consequently, there is no significant impact to prohibiting motorcycle use entirely. Additionally, the non-motorized uses of the 401 Trail that are consistent with the conservation values recognized by Montana statute and the majority of public users of the trail are enhanced by the use of motorcycles. The portion of the 401 Trail proposed for motorcycle use is a dead-end trail. The arterial trails (trail numbers 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, and 446) that connect with that portion of the 401 Trail and lead into the Lee Metcalf Wilderness are proposed as	Cherry Creek	Alternatives 4-6 would manage the 401 trails for non-motorized recreation opportunities, with an ancillary objective of minimizing trespass into the Lee Metcalf Wilderness. The primary management objectives for the Cherry Creek area are to provide primitive recreation opportunities. Alternative 7M proposes to manage this route as open to motorcycles from 6/15 through 9/15. The remainder of the year the entire area would be managed for non-motorized recreation activities under this alternative. There has been continued discussion about the management of this trail as of the time of this comment response. Please see the ROD and Detailed Description of the Decision regarding the management

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				non-motorized. Indeed, the southern leg of the 401 Trail itself is non-motorized. Consequently, there is no practical value in allowing motorcycles to essentially run back and forth over one small segment of a large network of trails leading into the Lee Metcalf Wilderness.		of the Cherry Creek Trail #401.
John Preston		767	Bozeman	I applaud the efforts that have been made to keep the snowmobiliers out of the wilderness near Cooke City - I know they have made a difference. In conjunction with this effort I would like to see snowmobiliers kept out of Sheep Creek in order to maintain this area for backcountry skiers.	Cooke City	In early conversations about the Benchmark, this discussion was given consideration - managing the Sheep Creek drainage as a non-motorized opportunity. After much conversation, the it was decided that Cooke City provided a very small coveted snowmobile opportunity, and was surrounded by millions of acres of non-motorized backcountry skiing opportunities. For this reason, no alternative considered this proposal.
Jason and Suzanne Hahn		54		Also in alt 7 there are seasonal restriction dates for motorized traffic in the CCTPA. Most trails show closures from Dec 2 - Jul 15. I am asking that this closure be pushed back to July 1. The tourist season is short in Cooke City and the two weeks can be important to a business owner. Understandably the same two weeks can have substantial detrimental affects to the environment by careless ATV operators. It was discussed in the Cooke City town meeting that the District Ranger will monitor this on a case-by-case basis and would be willing to open trails prior to the July 15 date. What concerns me is when Ken leaves and his replacement is asked to make the same judgment calls, that person may not be willing to take the risk. I would like to see education and information from the GNF regarding ATV operation during wet or seasonal times when resources are prone to damage. The current method of education that occurs in the CCTPA is to ticket a person once the resource damage is done. This is not an effective educational system. Education, awareness and signage will help prevent the resource damage that is intended to be prevented by July 15 closure.	Cooke City	In the preferred alternative, the trail and road system open to motorized use in the Cooke City area would generally be managed as open from June 15 - December 2. The travel plan decision will be implemented under the new National OHV direction and associated 36 CFR 261 regulations. Under these regulations, a motor vehicle use map will be published annually that described open routes and seasonal restrictions. The new regulations do not provide the flexibility to open routes earlier than the published dates - which was part of the rationale for moving the spring open date earlier in the preferred alternative in the FEIS. In the event that routes are still too soft, or snowcovered at that time, an emergency closure may be used to continue the route closure until the routes are suitable for public travel.
Robert Weinstein		1609		One thing I would like to bring up which I feel should be considered is the acknowledgement of the Woody Ridge/Falls trail as one for ATV usage. It is a popular trail up to a very scenic overlook of the large Woody Falls. ATV access should stop at the Woody	Cooke City	The existing route used by ATV's to access Woody Creek is an unauthorized user created route that is creating unacceptable resource damage. The system Trail #107 is a steep narrow single track routes, which is only appropriate for foot and horse travel. The preferred

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Falls overlook, although it is not the AB Wilderness Boundary.		alternative would manage the Woody Ck. Trail #107 as closed to motorized use, providing a non-motorized hiking opportunity close to Cooke City. The user created route would be closed to motorized travel and rehabilitated in the future under a separate project.
Kerry White		1616		The Slough Creek Corridor- Cooke City needs this motorized trail that would compliment the area around Goose Lake that we are proposing opening up to winter motorized use. This area will be brought out of wilderness and in exchange there is some area on the south side of the highway that we propose to be put into wilderness designation by congress. In meetings with Ken Britton this subject was brought up and his statement was that if this happened his enforcement problems would decrease. Enforcement is one of the big issues that the Forest Service wants to address in this travel plan so we can expect them to support our proposal.	Cooke City	The Slough Creek Corridor falls within the Absaroka Beartooth Wilderness, and is managed for non-motorized uses by law. This suggestion is outside the scope of this decision.
Pat Meyers		1101	Billings	Change the September 5 proposed seasonal closure date on any road to October 15. The proposed date completely removes a vast area from motorized use throughout the entire early hunting season in the Cooke City area which does not even open until September 15. Given the tremendous amount of acreage and rough terrain, it becomes a practical impossibility for anyone except horsemen to successfully hunt or fish and particularly retrieve game without at least the corridor access provided by Lulu, Abundance Road, and Goose Lake Jeep Trail. Also, the Grizzly Bear/White Bark Pine reasoning does not make sense. After all, if there really is measurable Grizzly Activity in the Fisher Creek/Sheep Mountain area, such activity is occurring now amidst some of the heaviest impact in the last several decades given the traffic caused by neighboring mine reclamation and cleanup.	Cooke City	In the preferred alternative, the trail and road system open to motorized use in the Cooke City area would generally be managed as open from June 15 - December 2. During years of high bear activity in favored whitebark pine stands - earlier closure of the Goose Lake Jeep Road, and area around Sheep Mountain may be necessary, and would be accomplished using an emergency closure order.
Pat Meyers		1101		Make the Spring Opening Road Specific, rather than a blanket July 15 date for all roads. A blanket opening date is unfair and makes no sense. Spend the time and resources making the opening date more specific and reasonably related to the needs of each particular access road.	Cooke City	In the preferred alternative, the trail and road system open to motorized use in the Cooke City area would generally be managed as open from June 15 - December 2. The travel plan decision will be implemented under the new National OHV direction and associated 36 CFR 261 regulations. Under these regulations, a motor vehicle use map will be published

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						annually that described open routes and seasonal restrictions. The new regulations do not provide the flexibility to open routes earlier than the published dates - which was part of the rationale for moving the spring open date earlier in the preferred alternative in the FEIS. In the event that routes are still too soft, or snowcovered at that time, an emergency closure may be used to continue the route closure until the routes are suitable for public travel.
Pat Meyers		1101		Sheep Mountain Road should be left open and not subject to even seasonal closure. This road offers tremendous corridor access for hunting and as well as wonderful vistas. A compromise could be a later fall closure and earlier spring opening.	Cooke City	In the preferred alternative, the trail and road system open to motorized use in the Cooke City area would generally be managed as open from June 15 - December 2. The travel plan decision will be implemented under the new National OHV direction and associated 36 CFR 261 regulations. Under these regulations, a motor vehicle use map will be published annually that described open routes and seasonal restrictions. The new regulations do not provide the flexibility to open routes earlier than the published dates - which was part of the rationale for moving the spring open date earlier in the preferred alternative in the FEIS. In the event that routes are still too soft, or snowcovered at that time, an emergency closure may be used to continue the route closure until the routes are suitable for public travel.
Pat Meyers		1101		No closure of Goose Lake Road above Star Lake - This historic trail provides Montanans and tourists alike access to many trail heads, lakes and streams that we in this community have also long enjoyed. The area is extremely rock and rough. I cannot believe that erosion is a substantial issue on this roadway.	Cooke City	Alternative 7M would manage the Goose Lake Jeep road as open to 4x4 vehicles to it's current end point near the gate below Goose Lake.
Andrew Rasmussen		330		Although I did not examine the entire document, I was looking at the trail management in the Cooke City area and notice all of the action alternatives implemented restrictions on mountain bike use on trails north of the highway. Mountain biking is a low impact activity and mixed use with hiking and horse riding is very feasible when trail use is not overly high and users are respectful. Please consider alternatives that are more bike friendly and gravel roads are not a replacement for the experience of a trail.	Cooke City	Alternative 7M would allow mountain bike travel on Trail 113 (Wolverine Pass) connecting with the Lake Abundance road - providing a substantial loop riding opportunity. All of the other trail segments north of Highway 212 are short stretches that all terminate at the Absaroka Beartooth Wilderness boundary, and would be managed as closed to mountain biking. These short routes (most are less than a mile) do not provide reasonable opportunities and invite mountain bike trespass into wilderness.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
John Preston		767		I would like to see snowmobiles kept out of Sheep Creek in order to maintain this area for backcountry skiers.	Cooke City	In early conversations about the Benchmark, this discussion was given consideration - managing the Sheep Creek drainage as a non-motorized opportunity. After much discussion, it was decided that Cooke City provided a very small coveted snowmobile opportunity, and was surrounded by millions of acres of non-motorized backcountry skiing opportunities. For this reason, no alternative considered this proposal.
				The proposed opening date for road used by wheeled vehicles (and horses) is too late. June 1 to June 15 is adequate for most trails in most years. When that is not true, the roads normally dictate their own usage and, if not, temporary closing based on reason, not whim, can be effectively employed.	Cooke City	In the preferred alternative, the trail and road system open to motorized use in the Cooke City area would generally be managed as open from June 15 - December 2. The preferred alternative would drop all seasonal restrictions for stock accessing trails within the Cooke City travel planning area.
Heidi Barrett		617		When making decisions in the Cooke area, there needs to be a division of user groups to minimize conflicts. I recommend that the Sheep Basin area remain closed to motorized use and be managed for skiing in winter, and hiking in summer.	Cooke City	In early conversations about the Benchmark, this discussion was given consideration - managing the Sheep Creek drainage as a non-motorized opportunity. After much discussion, it was decided that Cooke City provided a very small coveted snowmobile opportunity, and was surrounded by millions of acres of non-motorized backcountry skiing opportunities. For this reason, no alternative considered this proposal.
Greg Gordon		640		As there are so few areas accessible to backcountry skiers that are not overrun by snowmobiles. I ask that you consider prohibiting snowmobiles in Republic Creek, south of Cooke City and designating the treed gullies on the west slope of Henderson Mountain as a snowmobile-free zone. A simple rope fence along the Daisy Pass Road for 1-2 miles would be sufficient. This would greatly resolve user conflicts in the Cooke City area.	Cooke City	In alternative 7M, the Republic Mountain area - west of the trail would be managed as closed to snowmobiles. This was to maintain wilderness character in a recommended wilderness area. The Republic Creek Trail would remain open to snowmobiles, as would the portion of the drainage to the east of the trail. During public comment periods, we received a number of comments, that while this area provided some quality backcountry ski opportunities, that it was popular with a small number of snowmobilers as well. No alternative considers prohibiting snowmobiles from the gullies of Henderson Mountain. The Agency believes that Cooke City provides a very small area of high quality snowmobiling, and is surrounded by millions of acres of back country skiing opportunities in wilderness and Yellowstone NP, and therefore no alternative considered this proposal.
Steven Gehman		662		I am in support of the notion of motorized use with great controls. I believe that it will be extremely difficult if not impossible to effectively enforce road, trail, or area restrictions; how do you plan to keep	Cooke City	Enforcement of OHV use on designated routes has been a challenge for many years and will continue to present management challenges. With the improved visitor maps, guides and brochures that will be a product of the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				motorized users from leaving designated trails and roads?? I believe that large areas (much larger than the 3,765 acres of restricted area proposed, need to be totally closed to snowmobiles in order to protect wildlife values and watershed integrity, to reduce Wilderness trespass, and to provide more area for non-motorized uses.		travel planning effort, a heightened visitor information and education program, and user awareness we anticipate compliance to improve with time. OHV ranger presence will continue to be very important to provide visitor information, and "incentive" for compliance. The Forest Service saw no need to expand the snowmobile closures in the Cooke City Area simply to prohibit additional trespass in wilderness - we have a long established and very successful program of education, signing, and patrol which has significantly reduced illegal use of the wilderness. Neither watershed nor wildlife concerns surfaced during the several year analysis of proposed alternatives in this area as significant issues which would compel modifications of snowmobile opportunities provided today.
Nellie Isreal	Beartooth Alliance	669	Cooke City	We support the closure and signage of all unauthorized user-created ATV/motorized vehicle trails in the Cooke City Planning Area. Pertinent examples are the trails to Ovis and Corner Lakes and the trail up Woody Creek (Trail 107).	Cooke City	Thank you for your comments. Closure and signage of unauthorized user created routes has been and will be an ongoing effort in the Cooke City Area. The area around Cooke City has been closed to off-route travel for many years, and the travel plan will continue that direction.
David Courtis		276		Uninventoried Motorized Trails: I think that mountain bikes should also be prohibited. My concern is that if mountain bikes are allowed, motorcycle users (and then ATV users) will be tempted to start reusing these discontinued routes. Also, all of these unauthorized motorized trails should be obliterated.	Cooke City	We considered an alternative, though not in detail, which would limit mountain bike use to designated routes only. We found no compelling information or resource damage issues which would warrant taking those steps at this time. Obliteration of unauthorized user created routes will be ongoing project work covered under separate decisions from the travel plan.
Norbert Lehenbauer		398		The trail to the top of Fisher Mt. also gives a great view. It is a little more challenging for those who like this. It is nearly all rock, so I don't see any damage being done. I don't see this in the tables, but perhaps it has another #.	Cooke City	The access route to Fisher Mtn. is an abandoned mineral exploration route. A portion of this route is proposed to be reclaimed during mining restoration efforts to improve watershed conditions. This route was not proposed to be added as an open motorized route in any alternative, in part to comply with grizzly bear standards that prohibits the accretion of new motorized routes in occupied habitat.
Norbert Lehenbauer		398		My main disagreement is the restriction to close most trails Dec 2 through July 15. July 15 is much too late. Many people come to use these trails the fourth of July. I feel they should be open by June 15 or July 1 at the latest. Yes, some may still be wet, if that is the reason for the later opening, but they can be wet any time due to rains.	Cooke City	In the preferred alternative, the trail and road system open to motorized use in the Cooke City area would generally be managed as open from June 15 - December 2. The travel plan decision will be implemented under the new National OHV direction and associated 36 CFR 261 regulations. Under these regulations, a motor vehicle use map will be published

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						annually that described open routes and seasonal restrictions. The new regulations do not provide the flexibility to open routes earlier than the published dates - which was part of the rationale for moving the spring open date earlier in the preferred alternative in the FEIS. In the event that routes are still too soft, or snowcovered at that time, an emergency closure may be used to continue the route closure until the routes are suitable for public travel.
Noreen A. Breeding		9	Bozeman	Despite the large number of local skiers, the GNF lacks a cross-country ski trail system. There are no trails designed for cross-country skiers and dedicated to their use, with the exception of the Rendezvous ski area.	Cross-Country Skiing/ Snowshoeing	The Forest recognizes the current shortfall in providing high quality cross country ski trails, and that many of our existing routes are poorly marked or located to be the best opportunities. It is our goal to improve skiing opportunities by providing more high quality opportunities with the implementation of the travel plan. Cooperation from clubs and interested groups or individuals will be very important to improve the existing marking and management of ski trails.
Noreen A. Breeding		9		Table I-1 in the Travel Plan revision documents, lists 50 miles of groomed cross-country ski rails and 180 miles of marked trails as existing today. The latter number is grossly exaggerated as most of the marking no longer exists, if it ever did. I assume that the 180 miles is derived from the ski trails shown on the Travel Plan maps. Snowmobiles use the greater part of those trails making them unusable by skiers. And many miles of trail are not accessible at all because access roads are not plowed. Although snowmobile use on the logging roads in the Moser Creek area is ubiquitous, none of those routes appear on the maps as snowmobile routes. The maps, therefore, seem to be unreliable and do not show a true picture of actual or potential ski trails or snowmobile trails.	Cross-Country Skiing/ Snowshoeing	The Forest recognizes the current shortfall in providing high quality cross country ski trails, and that many of our existing routes are poorly marked or located to be the best opportunities. It is our goal to improve skiing opportunities by providing more high quality opportunities with the implementation of the travel plan. Cooperation from clubs and interested groups or individuals will be very important to improve the existing marking and management of ski trails. It is not a fair statement to say that skiers will not use routes that snowmobiles travel - some skiers prefer those routes because they don't have to break trail. The Travel Plan preferred alternative articulates numerous marked ski trails that will be off limits to snowmobiles, and some that will be dual use. All groomed trails will prohibit snowmobile travel - as will many of the marked routes (see the winter map). The travel plan also highlight many new winter access routes with an objective to secure reliable plowing to improve access. Plowing will be a function of available funding, and will rely on community support, local partnerships and club involvement to be successful.
Noreen A. Breeding		9		Most of the winter, all the trails in the Hyalite Canyon area are inaccessible to skiers because the road is not plowed. Then, why are these trails counted as	Cross-Country Skiing/ Snowshoeing	The travel plan maps are not designed to represent an inventory of existing routes or opportunities - but rather to articulate a "desired future condition" for the ski trail

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				ski trails on the maps? Of all the alleged marked cross-country ski trails shown on the Travel Plan revision maps, none are suitable for skiing with the exception of Bozeman Creek, Bear Canyon, and Brackett Creek.		system. We disagree with your contention that only 3 of the routes noted on the maps are suitable for skiing.
Noreen A. Breeding		9		Plowing Hyalite Canyon road to the reservoir will do little to correct this imbalance unless snowmobiles are also prohibited from the whole area from Moser Creek south. Skiers need many more trails from 5-10 miles in length that are designed for skiing, are not steep and narrow, are accessible from plowed roads, and are safe from snowmobile traffic. Some trails should also lead to rolling open terrain where skiers can venture off-trail to explore. It would be nice if the trails were marked, but grooming is not necessary.	Cross-Country Skiing/ Snowshoeing	The preferred alternative 7M proposes to manage much of the Hyalite drainage as dedicated to cross country ski/snowshoeing trails that are closed to snowmobiles. The preferred alternative would plow the road to the Blackmore Day Use site providing access to approximately 45 miles of marked or groomed routes to the public. Snowmobiling would be limited in the preferred alternative to an area bounded by Moser Creek Road on the south, Hyalite Road on the west, Bozeman Creek Divide on the east and the Forest Boundary on the north (see the winter map). In addition there would be a marked snowmobile trail from Moser Creek to the Grotto Falls trailhead that would provide ice climbers access to that popular climbing area.
Noreen A. Breeding		9		A reasonable goal for a trail system might be about 400miles of dedicated, marked cross-country ski trails. If a skier travels a different trail on every outing twice a week for six months, November through April, s/he would need access to about 48 trails averaging 8 miles in length.	Cross-Country Skiing/ Snowshoeing	While this would be an admirable goal, the Forest Service is bounded by wildlife management standards relative to protecting the threatened Lynx which prohibits us from entertaining such an ambitious proposal. Simply put, we cannot add new miles of marked or groomed trails in excess of what currently exists without significant mitigation in the form of closures to snow compacting uses elsewhere.
Noreen Breeding		1004	Bozeman	More areas w/ long as well as short trails and varied ski terrain are needed near Bozeman. Such places exist at Brackett Creek, Bear Canyon and Hyalite Canyon, but they are monopolized by snowmobiles. Build a correctly contoured ski trail from Bozeman Creek road to connect with old roads on the ridge separating it from Hyalite Canyon. On such a trail skiers could reach the roads in the Moser Creek area w/out Hyalite Canyon being opened. Dedicate Bear Canyon to skiers and ban snowmobiles to provide more ski terrain. A new trail for skiing is needed in New World Gulch. Good ski terrain also exists around Fairy Lake and could be opened to skiers by banning snowmobiles there.	Cross-Country Skiing/ Snowshoeing	We concur that there is a shortfall of dedicated cross country ski trail/snowshoe trails close to Bozeman. In the preferred alternative we addressed this concern by proposing that the bulk of Hyalite Canyon, the east slope of the Bridgers from Middle Fork of Brackett Creek south, the lower portion of Bear Canyon, South Cottonwood, Bozeman Creek, Stone Creek, New World Gulch, and Spanish Creek outside of the Lee Metcalf Wilderness be managed for non-motorized winter recreation opportunities. Please see the winter map for alternative 7M. The routes displayed on the 7M winter maps display "travel corridors" - actual physical route locations for ski trails will be located and constructed on-the-ground in the most suitable location under separate projects from this decision.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Eva Patten and Patti Steinmuller	BWAGs	467	Bozeman	several of the trails emphasized for cross-country skiing and snowshoeing (e.g., #504 Bangtails - steep and winding, and Tepee - generally snowless) are unrealistic choices for these purposes. In view of the fact that opportunities for cross-country skiing and snowshoeing have been overestimated in Alt. #7, we request that this issue be examined again.	Cross-Country Skiing/ Snowshoeing	Non-motorized winter trails identified in the travel plan are designed to be dual purpose for both skiing and snowshoeing. While we recognize that the Bangtail Divide Trail #504 provides a challenging ski opportunity - it is a reasonable snowshoe providing access to scenic overlooks. In Alternative 7M we responded to comments that the entire length of trail 504 between the Brackett Creek "Y" and Stone Creek might not be the most appropriate ski trail (too remote and difficult and shared with snowmobiles) and we dropped the middle section from the preferred alternative. The Tepee Creek trail was a map error, and is not included in the final preferred alternative. We believe we have provided a reasonable balance of front country ski/snowshoe opportunities close to Bozeman within our resource constraints that will complement opportunities provided by the community and private operations.
Noreen Breeding		454	Bozeman	Despite the fact that the Travel Plan counts over 200 miles of ski trail, less than half that amount is really suitable for skiing. This is so because most of the so-called ski trails are merely hiking trails which are not contoured for skiing. Trail #504 in the Bangtails, for example, is inaccessible as the approaches at both ends consist of a series of impossible switchbacks. And the whole trail on top of the ride is included in open snowmobile territory right alongside a snowmobile trail.	Cross-Country Skiing/ Snowshoeing	The Forest recognizes the current shortfall in providing high quality cross country ski trails, and that many of our existing routes are poorly marked or located to be the best opportunities. It is our goal to improve skiing opportunities by providing more high quality opportunities with the implementation of the travel plan. Cooperation from clubs and interested groups or individuals will be very important to improve the existing marking and management of ski trails.
Joe Polus		1487		Trail #156 - proposed to be an ATV trail - Bill stated this is a mistake on the map and the trail is to be motorcycle use only.	Deer Creeks	This trail is proposed to be managed for motorcycles and foot/stock travel in the preferred alternative. ATV's would be prohibited.
Jerome Onsager		955	Bozeman	Chapter III - page 1 states that summer users desired opportunities "within a reasonable travel distance from area communities" and "for trips to recreational destinations…" Page 2 of the Rationale does not extend that same consideration to snowmobilers.	Document	Your comment has been noted and the disparity corrected. Thank you.
Noreen Breeding		1004	Bozeman	Standard A-5: Omit the word "motorized" so that the sentence reads "Wheeled vehicle travel shall be prohibited off of designated routes" in light of current heavy and growing volume of mtn bike traffic. Bicycles generally travel far and faster than pedestrians and horses. Guideline A-11: Why are seasonal restrictions on motorized routes not	Document	We considered an alternative, though not in detail, which would limit mountain bike use to designated routes only. We found no compelling information or resource damage issues which would warrant taking those steps at this time. Regarding your comment on standard A-11 - motor vehicle seasonal restrictions will be part of the travel plan decision. The decision will be

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				included in this section? They are printed in the alternative tables for each trail and road. Please add the requirement for seasonal restrictions on motorized travel. Goal E: Why is Bear Canyon not included in the list of wildlife corridors? The chart contains several errors in Alt 7. Hyalite Road #62, seg 3 is to be plowed but skiing and snowshoeing are emphasized on it. On seg 4, no restrictions 5/16-12/1 for motorized vehicles is written. Does this mean that it is closed 12/2 to 5/15 or that ATVs can drive on this unplowed segment all winter? The proposed Chestnut Mtn Trail extension of trail #458 is described as going through Sec 20. Which township and range? An error in the table for Alt 7 allows snowmobile use on route #3160 even though snowmobiles are prohibited at the Hyalite end of the same road.		implemented under the new National OHV rules - by publishing a Motor Vehicle Use Map under 36 CFR 261. The seasonal restrictions are required to be published with this map, and will be legally imposed at that time. In that they constitute prohibitions under the new implementation regulations - no special standard is necessary to implement them. Regarding Goal E: Bear Canyon was included in a more generic description describing the importance of wildlife corridors between the Bridger/Bangtails and the Gallatin Range (Bear Canyon is in the Gallatin Range). Regarding the inconsistencies you noted for winter vehicle management in Hyalite - they've been noted and corrected in the FEIS.
Donald Lovely		758		regarding the web site and information reference in Volume 2, Chapter 3-312, I could not determine how this information was collected. It just seemed that hunting activities are under represented throughout all documents including the expanded social economic analysis. I was curious about which days were selected for the statistics... was the opening week of the big-game hunting season included in the samples if so, how was that information included in the statistical sample? I therefore could not reach a conclusion as to the validity of the presented data.	Document	References cited in Volume 2 were based on specialists completing literature reviews of recent research pertinent to their issues. Papers which were cited in the DEIS supporting analysis are listed here. Data used in the expanded social economic analysis largely relied upon statistically valid user surveys which were completed on the Gallatin NF in 2004. Days for sampling were selected randomly for the site types being sampled. See the website: http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum for a more complete description of sample methodology.
Kerry White		1616		Cross country skiers that I see bring their dogs with them a lot of the time. Not under control of the owner, these dogs interfere with dog sledders by getting tangled up with them. Squaw Creek, Moose Creek and Portal Creek are popular for dog sleds. I have seen them on Bracket Creek, Olson Creek, and Taylor's Fork. Multiple use areas should be posted so people are aware of the uses permitted.	Dog Sledding	There are no generic requirements for dogs to be leashed across the National Forest system, only at developed sites. Managing pets is outside of the scope of this decision, and should be addressed on a case by case basis on the individual ranger district where the concern is focused. Nothing in the proposed travel plan would prohibit travel with dog sleds anywhere.
Joe Chapman		1060	Livingston	I think with your plan to close the Bridgers to snowmobiling it will cause a huge influx of people to the Crazies and will cause an unsafe riding place. I know we will lose our parking lot which is on private land.	East Crazies	The travel plan does not propose to close the entire Bridger Range to snowmobiling, rather the proposal is to manage the high elevation areas and the southeast portion of the range as closed. Many high quality snowmobiling opportunities will be provided in the Bridgers under the preferred alternative.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		It seems that the FS is counting on the steepness of the terrain near the crest of the range to keep snowmobiles from traveling over the divide and trespassing onto the motor-free east slope of the Crazies. While the terrain may have been an effective barrier in the past, it may be only a matter of time until snowmobilers on machines designed right in Clyde Park will be able to crest the ridge and trespass on the east slope.	East Crazies	We recognize that highly experienced snowmobilers with good equipment may be able to access higher elevation terrain in the Crazies. When choosing boundary locations for proposed snowmobile closure areas, we attempted to rely on readily identifiable topographic boundaries to ensure users understood the intent. It is the responsibility of the riders to know where they are, and when they are approaching closed areas.
Alex Phillips		1483a		Trespass Creek: I hiked up on the first day of summer in about 2003 to find that the snow had not melted at all from the basin below the switchbacks. There were snowmobile tracks all over the place and almost to the very top of the ridge. The ridge will not act as a natural boundary to keep snowmobiles out of the eastside.	East Crazies	We recognize that highly experienced snowmobilers with good equipment may be able to access higher elevation terrain in the Crazies. When choosing boundary locations for proposed snowmobile closure areas, we attempted to rely on readily identifiable topographic boundaries to ensure users understood the intent. It is the responsibility of the riders to know where they are, and when they are approaching closed areas.
Scott M. Hancock		653	Livingston	I strongly urge that Cottonwood, Trespass, and Rock Creeks and adjacent lands in the SW crazies be designated non-motorized during all four seasons. I approach these drainages with trepidation these days as the noise intrusion and resource damage of a few ORVs can restrict my wild land experience. My access to these areas has been seriously limited, summer and winter, by the constant threat of ORV and ATV use.	East Crazies	Thank you for your comment. The open motorized configuration proposed in the Crazy Mountains is one with many difficult and challenging decisions for a variety of reasons. In the preferred alternative, Trespass Creek would be managed for non-motorized uses in the summer and open to snowmobiling in the winter. Rock Creek would be open to motorcycles to Rock Lake in the summer, and the entire drainage closed to snowmobiling in the winter. The Cottonwood trail would be open to ATV's and motorcycles to the private land boundary in section 9. The upper portions of trail 197 would be managed for foot and horse travel.
Robb Goodell		663		The trails at the upper basin are much too switchbacked and steep for even motorcycles. Noise on this basin carries for miles and is very disruptive. I've witnessed severe trail damage by motorcycles in the upper basin of Trespass Creek and serious ATV damage in the Lower Basin (ATVs are currently not allowed).	East Crazies	The Trespass Creek Trail is proposed to be managed for foot, horse and mountain bike travel in Alternative 7M. All summer motorized use would be prohibited.
Noreen Breeding		454		Motorcycle travel is inappropriate across the board. ATVs have only recently begun using this area and have already caused considerable damage to the trail and meadows. The so-called "natural barrier" that would prevent ATVs and motorcycles from continuing on up and over the ridge is insufficient as motorcycles have already been up there. Enforcing	East Crazies	The Trespass Creek Trail is proposed to be managed for foot, horse and mountain bike travel in Alternative 7M. All summer motorized use would be prohibited.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the closure of Segment 2 is not possible. Only 3 or 4 miles of trail are available to motorized use in Alt 7. This area is among the most highly desirable classic alpine country in the Crazies. How can risking the integrity of Trespass Creek basin and ruining the experience of many hikers and horse riders be justified for a few miles of motorized riding pleasure?		
Larry M. Tobin		863	Wilsall	Closing the main body of the Crazy Mountains to OHV and snowmobile use will only increase the pressure in the areas remaining open, damaging terrain in the case of OHV use and creating more conflicts among forest users. This will only lend to further closures, especially to OHV users.	East Crazies	Most Alternatives explored in the DEIS and Alternative 7M the preferred alternative in the FEIS would maintain some areas of open motorized use in the Crazy's where our trail easements allow for those uses. Please see the Alternative 7M maps.
Marcia and Henry N. Woolman III		537	Silver Gate	…we feel that there should be no expansion of the existing roads into the Gallatin. …we believe the impact to wildlife and the well being of the land and water are the primary purpose that these lands were designated as NF. We would hope that better enforcement would be available as those who destroy habitat are few in number, but if a few of them paid fines the results would be multiplied by word of mouth. Larry McKee does a great job and we find most of the locals respect the signs and just need to be educated as to why roads, etc. are off limits. A little education goes a long way.	Education	None of the travel plan alternatives propose to construct new roads. Several new motorized trails are proposed - primarily to link up existing motorized trails and provide higher quality loop routes. We concur that education and good information are powerful tools to encouraging ethical behavior.
Mark Lamm		539	Bozeman	I would like to see a comprehensive educational curriculum included in the travel plan, much like the hunter safety courses, that might be a free, yet required prerequisite for all types of access. It seems like the message of "stewardship" through responsible access use and a willingness to respect forest habitat, although implied through management directives, is all but absent from all travel plan alternatives in the DEIS.	Education	While this suggestion has some appeal, it is outside the scope of the travel plan decision. The travel plan will only make decisions about what sorts of uses are appropriate on what routes, not on mandating special permitting or educational requirements. In the implementation section of the plan we do discuss the importance of a comprehensive information and education plan, and will be focusing much attention on the components of that plan from enforcement, to signing, to maps/brochures/training tools during the implementation of the plan.
Brian Hawthorn	Blue Ribbon Coalition	1196		Most problems associated with recreation can be addressed by education. Education should be the first line of action and all education measures should be exhausted before pursuing other actions.	Education	We agree that information and education is important to protect resources, but there are some issues that require other measures, such as use restrictions, to resolve. Thanks for your comment.
Bruce Brock		1208		When folks get maps or information they could receive a "code of the trail" guideline similar to a code of the west that has been developed to share	Education	Thanks for the suggestion. There are numerous publications available regarding backcountry etiquette - from programs like Tread Lightly, Leave No Trace, and

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				with newcomers to Madison County.		Ride the Right Trail. We will use all resources available to bolster our education efforts.
Jeremy Ferkin		100		I think a great majority of our problems can be solved by merely doing a better job of policing those people who break the use laws….increasing penalties for those who break the laws and create possibly a TIPMONT thing for those violating the use laws.	Enforcement	Thank you for your suggestions. TIPMONT is used by the Agency (a 1-800 HOTLINE provided by MT FWP to report violations), and will likely be a tool available to us in the future. Bonds have recently been set by US District Courts for violations of motorvehicle prohibitions, and are periodically updated based on feed back from local managers. Bonds for motor vehicle violations have been raised in recent years.
Jeremy Ferkin		100		I would like to see some sort of better trail marking system developed and or the default system you suggest which is if no sign, "assume restricted" but then there has to be a penalty for ignoring it…and a penalty for those destroying the signs…	Enforcement	The Travel Plan will be implemented under the 2006 National OHV rules. This system mandates that routes be designated, and all routes that are not shown on the official "Motor Vehicle Use Map" are closed to motor vehicle travel. This map will include a listing of all seasonal restrictions as well and will be published annually. Under this new rule, the map becomes the enforcement tool - the Agency is no longer required to post prohibitions on the ground. It is up to the user to know their location and whether they are on an open route or not. The Forest will make extra effort to sign open routes, and provide reminders about closed routes until the new system is "institutionalized".
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Establish clear enforcement mechanisms for route closure to enforce permanent route closures, closures to public use, seasonal or temporary closures, and restrictions on off road travel in designated areas or times of year.	Enforcement	The Travel Plan will be implemented under the 2006 National OHV rules. This system mandates that routes be designated, and all routes that are not shown on the official "Motor Vehicle Use Map" are closed to motor vehicle travel. This map will include a listing of all seasonal restrictions as well and will be published annually. Under this new rule, the map becomes the enforcement tool - the Agency is no longer required to post prohibitions on the ground. It is up to the user to know their location and whether they are on an open route or not. The Forest will make extra effort to sign open routes, and provide reminders about closed routes until the new system is "institutionalized".
Pat Simmons	Sierra Club	1545		We recommend that the FS look to volunteers to provide an organized monitoring and reporting system throughout the forest. They could provide additional eyes on the forest to assist in pinpointing out problem areas. They could also assist in trail repair and maintenance.	Enforcement	Thanks you for this suggestion. The volunteer component of trail and recreation management is hugely important to this National Forest now, and will continue to be in the future.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Karen Bucklin Sanchez		507	Bozeman	Increased forest use of all kinds - foot traffic, mountain bikes, motorcycles, horses, etc. makes it imperative that the more erosive types of travel be required to be on-trail and the uses be clearly marked. Match the level of maintenance and enforcement the FS provide to the final plan. Motorized travel should be limited to what can reasonably be budgeted. Three years ago I was passed by a Chevy Blazer while hiking up a trail in Bear Canyon. The trail is clearly marked as closed to vehicles over 50", but I suspect there is little incentive to follow the posted limit if enforcement is not forthcoming. Motorized travel is difficult to reverse, once enacted.	Enforcement	All summer motorized travel will be required to use designated routes only in the preferred alternative. Winter motorized travel will only be restricted to designated routes where that route passes through a closed area. The travel plan does not propose in any alternative to restrict, foot, horse or bicycle travel to designated routes at this time.
Charlene Locke		511	Bozeman	Compliance will always be an issue. As an example, my son and I skied in Stone Creek last March. We were appalled to see a group of snowmobilers ride right around the gate with the sign clearly saying No Snowmobiles.	Enforcement	Enforcement of travel restrictions will be an ongoing effort.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Enforcement: as it is recognized that enforcement can be difficult, citations and fines should be substantial in order to discourage OHV users from illegally going out of designated areas. Enforcement of road closures is an area of particular concern on the Gallatin. We would like to see a concrete plan for assuring effective closures through monitoring, enforcement and use of closure methods that functionally close routes.	Enforcement	The Travel Plan will be implemented under the 2006 National OHV rules. This system mandates that routes be designated, and all routes that are not shown on the official "Motor Vehicle Use Map" are closed to motor vehicle travel. This map will include a listing of all seasonal restrictions as well and will be published annually. Under this new rule, the map becomes the enforcement tool - the Agency is no longer required to post prohibitions on the ground. It is up to the user to know their location and whether they are on an open route or not. The Forest will make extra effort to sign open routes, and provide reminders about closed routes until the new system is "institutionalized". TIPMONT is used by the Agency, and will likely be a tool available to us in the future. Bonds have recently been set by US District Courts for violations of motorvehicle prohibitions, and are periodically updated based on feed back from local managers. Bonds for motor vehicle violations have been raised in recent years.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Any enforcement plan should include an effective education program to explain its management of recreational use and impacts on the forest. This program should include, for example, maps and signs that clearly explained the purpose of	Enforcement	We agree. Efforts are underway to ensure a comprehensive information and education effort is well orchestrated across the Forest. We plan to provide a family of maps and brochures as well as other educational tools during implementation. Cooperation

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				restrictions or closures to certain kinds of recreational uses in specific places.		with clubs, groups and individuals who are willing to assist with these efforts will be important.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		A solid implementation plan and budget are needed for public information and enforcement. MWA will be willing and eager to contribute volunteer services toward, and to support funding requests for, a comprehensive, effective implementation strategy.	Enforcement	We agree. Efforts are underway to ensure a comprehensive information and education effort is well orchestrated across the Forest. We plan to provide a family of maps and brochures as well as other educational tools during implementation. Cooperation with clubs, groups and individuals who are willing to assist with these efforts will be important.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We cannot overemphasize how important it will be to hit the ground running with the implementation effort as soon as the plan is approved. A major effort to install new signs and trailhead information should be well planned in advance. An informative patrol and enforcement "blitz" during the first summer and winter seasons, involving law enforcement and recreation personnel detailed from other Forests as feasible, will help immensely in establishing the new travel scheme. Enforcement personnel should visit motor sports shops to explain the new regulations, as well as patrolling trails and trailheads affected by new regulations.	Enforcement	We agree. Efforts are underway to ensure a comprehensive information and education effort is well orchestrated across the Forest. We plan to provide a family of maps and brochures as well as other educational tools during implementation. Cooperation with clubs, groups and individuals who are willing to assist with these efforts will be important.
Heidi Barrett		617	Bozeman	The Forest Service must provide for enforcement of regulations regarding motorized us in all areas of the forest. If the Forest Service cannot provide for motorized regulation enforcement, the area must be managed for non-motorized use only.	Enforcement	Enforcement of regulations is part of everyday operations on National Forests. Please see the enforcement section in chapter 3 for details of current staffing. Suggesting that if the Forest Service is unable to enforce every motorized violation we should manage the entire Forest as non-motorized is akin to suggesting that if the Hwy Patrol were unable to enforce all speeding violations or drunken drivers they should shut down the highway system and is not a reasonable alternative to consider.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		The Final EIS should include at least a summary of how the new travel plan will be implemented and enforced. Until the plan hits the ground it means little, and without enforcement it will have many holes in it.	Enforcement	Chapter 3, Issue 11 - Transportation System Implementability and Chapter 3 Issue 6 - Enforcement both contain discussions about implementation of the proposed alternatives. Please see these discussions.
Reggie Clark		565	Belgrade	The Gallatin needs to do a better job of posting and policing their closures and restrictions. Currently, motorized users are in areas that are closed to motorized and creating miles of user built trails.	Enforcement	The Gallatin NF acknowledges that we can improve patrol and policing presence in the field. Funding and personnel shortfalls shortages have and will likely continue to provide hurdles to a well staffed program. We have been successful in increasing the number of summer OHV rangers and winter snow rangers in recent

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						years, through grant writing, and anticipate similar successes in the future. The Travel Plan will be implemented under the 2006 National OHV rules. This system mandates that routes be designated, and all routes that are not shown on the official "Motor Vehicle Use Map" are closed to motor vehicle travel. This map will include a listing of all seasonal restrictions as well and will be published annually. Under this new rule, the map becomes the enforcement tool - the Agency is no longer required to post prohibitions on the ground. It is up to the user to know their location and whether they are on an open route or not. The Forest will make extra effort to sign open routes, and provide reminders about closed routes until the new system is "institutionalized".
Bob Gossack		344	Bozeman	Don't close areas if you are not able to patrol them. Change your signs. I heard you were considering the assumption that everything is presumed closed unless the sign says open. This probably has its shortcoming but may have some merit. Huge license plates on the back might also be a requirement.	Enforcement	The Travel Plan will be implemented under the 2006 National OHV rules. This system mandates that routes be designated, and all routes that are not shown on the official "Motor Vehicle Use Map" are closed to motor vehicle travel. This map will include a listing of all seasonal restrictions as well and will be published annually. Under this new rule, the map becomes the enforcement tool - the Agency is no longer required to post prohibitions on the ground. It is up to the user to know their location and whether they are on an open route or not. The Forest will make extra effort to sign open routes, and provide reminders about closed routes until the new system is "institutionalized". The licensing suggestion is a good one - but out of the scope and jurisdiction of this decision (licensing is a State responsibility).
Noreen Breeding		454		A more detailed timeline and budget for public education and information and enforcement is needed to ensure that the public will be properly informed, in a timely manner.	Enforcement	Chapter 3, Issue 11 - Transportation System Implementability and Chapter 3 Issue 6 - Enforcement both contain discussions about implementation of the proposed alternatives. Please see these discussions.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	The continuing illegal use of the forest by motorized users has already caused serious damage and extensive illegal trail systems. Groups of motorized users have defied Forest Service authority, most blatantly during attempted closure of an illegal motorcycle trail in the Baldy Mountain in 2004, with no recourse from the USFS.	Enforcement	We are aware of the issues surrounding the creation of unauthorized user created routes and take actions within our capabilities to curtail these activities.
Dean and Madelein Bladow		1191	Cooke City	We strongly support increased law enforcement and trail management of the roads and trails within	Enforcement	Thank you for your support.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Cooke City Travel Planning Area. This has been minimal in the past.		
John McDonnell		153	Belgrade	I like the idea of seasonal restrictions that limit ATV/motorcycle use during hunting season. I feel that many violations occur during hunting season and FS is simply not able or going to be able to patrol all of these areas. Therefore, if any area is closed entirely during the season violators will be less likely to "try their luck" because they will stick-out like a sore thumb.	Enforcement	Seasonal restrictions for OHV use on trails during hunting season are proposed in the preferred alternative for a variety of reasons - principally to provide wildlife habitat security, and to provide high quality hunting opportunities in a non-motorized setting. Please see the Detailed Description of Alternative 7M for a complete listing of proposed fall seasonal restrictions and the rationale.
Anne Banks	BWAGS	1177	Bozeman	From a resource standpoint, the snowmobile closure of the entire area south of Brackett Creek and upper elevation area west of trail # 500 nearly to Flathead Pass is and excellent decision, protecting lynx, wolverine denning and mountain goat habitat. Enforcement, however, will be difficult, as the meadows and chutes above the groomed trails are popular snowmobile play areas.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 7M would maintain the configuration you describe as acceptable. We understand that enforcement will be challenging, we intend to work with user groups, our snowrangers, and volunteers to gain compliance with the proposed closure boundaries through adequate signing, patrol and education.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Proposed Brackett Cr. Snowmobile Closure - Need access thru this closure to get to open country on West side of Bridgers (over pass at Sacagawea Pk). Closing Brackett Creek area to snowmobilers is like closing the M to hikers - it's a big deal. What about moving the northern closure boundary (Frazier Lake area) one more ridge to the north to the natural terrain boundary. This would eliminate enforcement issues. Approximately 60% of the Brackett Creek Snowmobile closure is alright. This is area that is not desirable or rideable for snowmobiles.	Fairy Lake	The Forest received many comments from the public about the proposed winter snowmobile closures in the preferred alternative in the DEIS on the east side of the Bridgers - both pro and con. Based on feedback from snowmobilers, backcountry skiers and Mt Fish Wildlife and Parks biologists, a revised closure map was created that provides more of the challenging snowmobile terrain that is currently available, while still providing protection for critical winter wildlife habitat, and segregated areas for backcountry skiing. The North Fork of Brackett Creek, Fairy Lake/Creek and the Carroll Creek area will be managed for snowmobiling. Access is also provided to the ridge above Fairy Lake. This configuration allows snowmobile access to popular play areas, and to areas that would be managed as non-motorized for backcountry skiing. Please see the Alternative 7M winter map for a complete picture of the trail system and open areas.
Jed Statz		1563	Bozeman	The Brackett Creek closure is not acceptable. Why not make south fork of Brackett non- motorized, cross country ski only that would be mitigation. I enjoy back country snowboarding via snowmobile and my needs not been addressed.	Fairy Lake	The Forest received many comments from the public about the proposed winter snowmobile closures in the preferred alternative in the DEIS on the east side of the Bridgers - both pro and con. Based on feedback from snowmobilers, backcountry skiers and Mt Fish Wildlife and Parks biologists, a revised closure map was created that provides more of the challenging snowmobile terrain

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						that is currently available, while still providing protection for critical winter wildlife habitat, and segregated areas for backcountry skiing. The North Fork of Brackett Creek, Fairy Lake/Creek and the Carroll Creek area will be managed for snowmobiling. Access is also provided to the ridge above Fairy Lake. This configuration allows snowmobile access to popular play areas, and to areas that would be managed as non-motorized for backcountry skiing. Please see the Alternative 7M winter map for a complete picture of the trail system and open areas.
Carl Krob		1377	Bozeman	I strongly oppose closing the high country of Brackett Creek to snowmobiles. Snowmobiles cause absolutely no damage to this area. Skiers are nonexistent except for those that use snow machines to access the backcountry. Based on these study done in Lincoln, Montana snowmobiles have no negative impact on the lynx population.	Fairy Lake	Information provided to us by the skiing community, and our own monitoring observations indicate that this portion of the Bridgers is equally popular with backcountry skiers as with snowmobilers. Many skiers do access their favorite spots by snowmobiling to the starting points. The Forest received many comments from the public about the proposed winter snowmobile closures in the preferred alternative in the DEIS on the east side of the Bridgers - both pro and con. Based on feedback from snowmobilers, backcountry skiers and Mt Fish Wildlife and Parks biologists, a revised closure map was created that provides more of the challenging snowmobile terrain that is currently available, while still providing protection for critical winter wildlife habitat, and segregated areas for backcountry skiing. The North Fork of Brackett Creek, Fairy Lake/Creek and the Carroll Creek area will be managed for snowmobiling. Access is also provided to the ridge above Fairy Lake. This configuration allows snowmobile access to popular play areas, and to areas that would be managed as non-motorized for backcountry skiing. Please see the Alternative 7M winter map for a complete picture of the trail system and open areas. Please see the FEIS chapter 3 for a complete analysis of concerns with snowmobiling relative to wintering wildlife.
Nancy Ostlie		956	Bozeman	In Brackett Creek, Hyalite or Bear Canyon motorized users are often present disturbing our experiences. We seek wildlife sightings which are less likely in areas of motorized use.	Fairy Lake	We realize that wildlife viewing is the most rapidly growing recreation activity (see the Chapter 3, Recreation Effects) in the Rockies. A significant goal of the proposed travel plan revision is to provide more dedicated non-motorized recreation opportunities. Several of the trails in Brackett Creek are proposed to be managed as non-motorized, as is Blackmore,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Westshore, and History Rock in Hyalite. Please see the Alternative 7M summer maps. In addition - the decision is considering a "time share" concept on many of the Hyalite and Bridger trails that are proposed to be open to motorcycles in the summer. Please see the ROD for more discussion on which routes will likely have a "time share" component (that is certain days of the week or some such configuration, motorized routes would be managed for foot and stock travel only).
Hermes Lynn		67	Bozeman	Backcountry skiing - there is very limited access for those people who do not own or choose to own snowmobiles. Currently the only reasonable access has been to the north and south of Bridger Bowl and a few other places such as Mt. Ellis. When Bridger expands these access opportunities will be lost and I am wondering if you guys have given this any thought. My proposal is that the FS plow at least one access in the Bridgers, for example the Brackett Creek road or Fairy Lake road and have a parking lot for day backcountry enthusiasts.	Fairy Lake	The preferred alternative 7M identifies two plowed access points in the Brackett Ck./Fairy Lake area. One objective is to secure public access to Section 30 adjacent to the upper parking lot in Bridger Bowl. This will provide access to the Slushman's trail system and numerous opportunities for backcountry skiing. Another plowed access point that is proposed is along the Fairy Lake road to a winter parking facility at the junction of Road #1774 and the Fairy Lake Road. This proposal is predicated on the successful completion of the Brackett Creek land exchange - a separate action from the Travel Plan decision. The preferred alternative also proposes to plow the Hyalite road to the Blackmore Day Use site, which will provide easy access to high quality backcountry skiing opportunities in that drainage.
Mariann Van Den Elzen		1071	Bozeman	I also am against snowmobile use north of Ross Pass. There are so few places that quiet users can go in the winter without being impacted by the sounds of machines. Even though there are restrictions on snowmobiles in certain areas, the FS does not have the staff or funds to adequately patrol the lands. Thus, as it stands snowmobilers go unchecked when they are in restricted areas.	Fairy Lake	Alternative 7M proposes to manage portions of the Bridger Range north of Ross Pass as closed to snowmobiles, with some open areas. Snowmobile opportunities would be concentrated in the lower elevation areas including the North Fk. Brackett Creek, Fairy Lake and north along the Carroll Creek Road system to Flathead Pass (see the Alternative 7M winter map). Much of the higher elevation slopes north of Ross Pass are proposed to be managed as non-motorized.
Jon Schwedler		1126		Given the expansion of Bridger Bowl into wolverine habitat as much of the Bridgers as possible should be set aside for wolverines from motorized traffic.	Fairy Lake	Secure winter wildlife habitat was a primary consideration in drafting the proposed configuration for non-motorized areas in the Bridgers. Please see the winter map for the preferred alternative 7M.
Brian Sobrepena		1557		One Big area that I would hate to see closed is the east side of the Bridgers in the winter time. I've been downhill skiing all my life here in Bozeman. But someone thinks I don't belong there because I use a snowmobile to get to some of the best skiing in the state in the East Bridger Bracket Drainage.	Fairy Lake	Snowmobile access to popular ski terrain on the east slopes of the Bridgers was a significant factor in drafting the final configuration for winter use proposed in Alternative 7M. Many commenters told us their preferred method to access coveted ski terrain was via snowmobiles, and we attempted to accommodate that

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						need by providing access from the N. Fk. of Brackett through Fairy Lake Basin and north to Flathead Pass in the final configuration. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		Native Forest Network supports the Friends of the Gallatin Forest proposal for a snowmobile area which extends to the Bridger divide on the east side, with an area wide closure on the west side, and a closure as proposed for the South and Middle Forks of Brackett Creek.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Dan Barnes		695	Bozeman	Please consider leaving the east side of the Bridger range open to snowmobiling. This would include Brackett Creek, Fairy Lake, Ross Pass, and all of the areas in between. These are the areas we use for skiing and snowmobile recreating most often.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Bruce Brock		1208	Bozeman	Brackett Creek Y west up the north fork area and all area north from Ross Peak to Flathead pass - here the play areas are all above (west) of the groomed trail with few below it 9east). I think this trail and play areas should be open in season, Dec to April 30. The Altitude restriction mentioned for Fairy lake area could apply here if needed.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Bruce Brock		1208		Ross Peak and North to Fairy Lake - All area open to snowmobiles in Sec. 2, 35, 36, 26, 23, 24 with no play above 8500'.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 551 - Ross Pass and 6948 - Motorized - summer and winter leave open - this area is a great place to ride to the saddle and watch a sunset (great	Fairy Lake	Alternative 7M proposes to manage Trail 551 as open to motorcycles from June 15 - October 15. Portions of road 6948 have been incorporated into the new S. Fk. Of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				view).		Brackett Creek access, and will be open to passenger car access to the new Ross Pass Trailhead. The remainder of the route in Section 12 are proposed to be managed for 4x4 high clearance vehicles.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 631 - Bracket - Motorized - Summer and winter - leave open - this area is a good place to explore and wildlife to watch.	Fairy Lake	Road number 631 was reconstructed in 2005/2006 and now provides the primary summer motorized access to the S. Fk. And Middle Forks of Brackett Creek. In Alternative 7M, this route is proposed to be managed as open to passenger cars in the summer, and closed to motorized use in the winter to provide a cross country ski trail opportunity.
Eric Ferguson		909	Bozeman	Please do not close the upper elevations of Brackett Creek to snowmobiling. I enjoy backcountry skiing there very much.	Fairy Lake	Snowmobile access to popular ski terrain on the east slopes of the Bridgers was a significant factor in drafting the final configuration for winter use proposed in Alternative 7M. Many commenters told us their preferred method to access coveted ski terrain was via snowmobiles, and we attempted to accommodate that need by providing access from the N. Fk. of Brackett through Fairy Lake Basin and north to Flathead Pass in the final configuration. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Denise Hayman		924	Bozeman	I no longer ski Brackett Creek and other areas nearby due to the noise and unsafe use of snowmobiles.	Fairy Lake	Alternative 7M proposes to manage the southeast portion of the Bridgers including the Middle and South Forks of Brackett Creek for non-motorized winter recreation. Snowmobiles would be prohibited in these areas in the preferred alternative. In this alternative, the primary access point for snowmobiles would be moved from the Brackett Ck. "Y" parking facility, north to Battle Ridge.
Kerry White		1616		I don't think that this area is any good for motorized winter use unless the 534 trails could be improved to accommodate that use. Trail 538 would be a good cross country trail but I would like to see a week or two of motorized use to allow for some maintenance and improvements.	Fairy Lake	Trail 534 is not proposed for emphasis of any winter uses, due to the inconsistent snow conditions on the west side of the Bridgers. Trail # 538 Is also not proposed for emphasized winter use in the preferred alternative, but does bisect a popular backcountry ski destination and would be available for backcountry skiing in all alternatives.
Duane Halverson		1309		Trail 2518 following the boundary of 540 is an someone's imagination in your department. The numbers on the map are there, the trail, at the present for snowmobile use, is not.	Fairy Lake	The trails shown on the Alternative 7M map following Road # 2518 follow an existing road system, and are proposed to be added to the current snowmobile trail system. They are not currently groomed routes but are proposed to be in the future. The maps represent "desired future condition" - not necessarily existing situation in many cases.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Duane Halverson		1309		I would like to make a proposal that would assist others in using the North Bridger area. I would recommend that the closed sections 26, 36, and 2, east of the ridges between Fairy Lake and Ross Peak remain open for cross-country travel allowing recreational use from trailhead 743 to The Fairy Lake Campground at trailhead 74.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		This popular snowmobile destination has much historical significance. This use has been increasing since the early 1960. The rationale behind the forest service proposed closures is because of Wolverine habitat. Another reason the Forest Supervisor wants to restrict snowmobile use in this area is to provide more quiet trails for cross country skiing closer to Bozeman. This is a poor management decision to close such a popular snowmobile area when many cross-country skiing areas already exists close to Bozeman.	Fairy Lake	Our analysis of recreation opportunities identified a shortfall of readily accessible "family friendly" front country skiing opportunities close to Bozeman that are managed as exclusively non-motorized. Many member of the public corroborated that finding. Separating uses in the Bridgers -providing cross country skiing opportunities in the southeastern portion of the mountain range, and a mix of snowmobiling and backcountry skiing in the N. Fork Brackett to Flathead Pass area was largely supported by public comment. Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Todd Hoitsma		1340		I support closure of South Bracket to any machine access in winter. This is a key access for us to steeper slopes on the east side of the Bridgers. Please realize backcountry skiers (or at least those snowmobile access backcountry skiers) need some areas between Ross Pass and Fairy Lake.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Paul House		1346	Bozeman	I would support a modified version of Alternative 7, which would allow some areas of motorized use. The area immediately north of Ross Pass would remain motorized, then about a square mile of terrain would be non-motorized. This area has longtime traditional use by skiers and seems to be less desirable to the snowmobilers, so it seemed a logical split.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301		in addition to the Bridger proposal, GYC anchorage is the forest service to establish a place for cross-country skiing in the Bridgers. The South and Middle Brackett Creek areas south of Ross Pass is a perfect place to accommodate the needs of cross-country skiers.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Snowmobile trail along Battle Ridge, connecting to #500 in the upper North Fork. We oppose construction of this new snowmobile trail because it cuts through the heart of terrain now heavily used by skiers and snowshoers, and because snowmobilers can already reach trail #500 from the Fairy Lake Road.	Fairy Lake	The proposed Brackett Creek land exchange, which should be completed during the calendar year 2006, necessitates reconfiguring the snowmobile trail access into the Fairy Lake area. In the preferred alternative, the new snowmobile route would skirt to the east of trail 500 proper. All of the terrain to the west of trail 500 is proposed to be closed to snowmobiles in this alternative. See the Alternative 7M winter map.
Don Bachman		625		The Fairy Lake Campground is one of the few campgrounds on the GNF that is isolated from a through-travel or paved corridor and thus meets a need for a quiet and safe camping experience. The noise of ATVs and trail bikes is intrusive enough in this area without encouraging it.	Fairy Lake	You raise a good point. Alternative 7M, the preferred alternative does propose to allow ATV's on trail #500 - which runs below Fairy Lake. This trail does not bisect the campground, but noise would likely be audible from OHV's using this route. OHV travel in the campground proper would be limited to street legal motorcycles or ATV's with proper licensing and licensed riders. Trail #534 does leave from very near the campground and is proposed to be managed for foot and stock travel only in the preferred alternative. The Halfmoon Campground in the Crazies would also provide the sort of experience you describe under alternative 7M.
Thomas B. Wells		553		Objective 2(2): In the creation of these routes please make certain they are separate from the Shafthouse trail. Any crossings will be an open invitation for snowmobilers to go towards core areas. Please reduce the crossover by limiting the loop use of #540.	Fairy Lake	Trail #540 would not be used in any of the snowmobile trails proposed in Alternative 7M. The first 1/2 mile or so of this route would however be in an open snowmobile area. The northern sections of this trail would all lie within an area proposed to be closed to snowmobiles. Please see the winter Alternative 7M map for details.
Anita Strawn de Ojeda		679		Keep Fairy Lake open to snowmobiles and cross-country skiers. I personally don't have problems sharing space with either group of people - not to mention that there are some other nice trails (roads) near Fairy Lake that could be kept open exclusively for cross-country skiers.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area Backcountry Skiers	681		Flathead Pass (not on map) - the far northern Bridgers offer good BC skiing, which currently has only a few visitors. Snowmobiling opportunities are limited here. Ski-bilers would prefer keeping the road open to snowmobiles, but making an area closure to off-trail travel.	Fairy Lake	In the preferred alternative, all of the terrain to the west of the Carroll Creek road #75 in the Flathead Pass area would be managed as closed to snowmobiles. The Flathead Pass road proper is a county road - over which this proposal has no jurisdiction.
Alan Oram		713		The area between Fairy Lake and North to Flathead Pass: I would like to see this entire area closed to off road snowmobiling as well. If we were to choose sides, I would advocate that the area to the North of the Fairy Lake road be open for snowmobile traffic and that to the South of the Road including the basin beneath Sacagawea and Hardscrabble be closed to off road sledding.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M. In the preferred alternative, all of the terrain to the west of the Carroll Creek road #75 in the Flathead Pass area would be managed as closed to snowmobiles. The Flathead Pass road proper is a county road - over which this proposal has no jurisdiction.
Noreen Breeding		454		Closing Brackett Creek (#631) and Middle Brackett (#6948), Ross Peak Trail (#525), Shafthouse Trail (#540), Bridger Foothills Trail (#534), and the Honeymoon Trail (#551) to snowmobiles is excellent. This is the only area of public land in the Bridger Range with good ski terrain and reliable snowfall. It is very popular with skiers and families with children. Very few skiers are able to reach Ross Pass and the higher slopes that harbor wolverines. Prohibiting snowmobiles will provide protection for the wolverines.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Noreen Breeding		454		Trail #551 on the east slope of Ross Pass is severely eroded now and continued motorized use will make it worse. Hiking trail #525 joins the upper ends of #631 and #6948 below Ross Pass and continues on up #551. With part of the route motorized, a conflict between users will occur. There are very few hiking trails on the east side of the Bridger Range. All of the trails, except for #525 require a long bruising drive up the rough and rocky road to Fairy Lake. To provide a balance of opportunities, the upper	Fairy Lake	Several people shared with us that they felt this trail should be managed for non-motorized use only - given it's heavy pedestrian traffic and perceived lack of non-motorized opportunities on the east side of the Bridgers. Alternative 7M does propose to manage this route as open to motorcycles from June 15 - October 15. However considering public input and the growing popularity and use of trails in the Bridgers - we are including this route in a group of trails close to Bozeman where a "time share" use may be employed in the future.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				reaches of South and Middle Brackett Creeks must be reserved for foot traffic.		That is - that on certain days of the week, or some other configuration, this trail would be managed for foot and stock travel only. The preferred alternative identifies this proposal, but would not make the actual decision at this time. Instead, the Forest Supervisor would work with interested parties after implementation of the travel plan to develop a "time share" scenario that would be implemented at a later date.
Greg Beardslee	Gallatin Ridge Riders Contact - Gallatin Valley Bicycle Club	1785		If I am reading the maps correctly, the upper Fairy Lake 500 trail will become an ATV trail. Please do not allow this single-track trail to become an ATV route. Create the ATV route below the existing trail a ways. By doing this, we could retain a valuable single-track trail and the ATVers would get a new, good condition access across the Bridgers. As the ATV trail goes north, beyond the Fairy Lake Road, be prepared to gate off the lower Shafthouse trail, because ATVs will surely poach it all the way to the Seitz Road trailhead.	Fairy lake	The travel plan by design only makes "corridor" decisions relative to the proposed routes for different uses. If actual reconstruction or construction of a route is necessary to implement the preferred alternative it must be done under a separate NEPA decision. At that time the effects of the actual on-the-ground location will be evaluated, and routes potentially relocated to the most suitable location. While Trail 500 is proposed to be managed as an ATV route - the actual on the ground location has not been analyzed yet. Your suggestion for an alternative parallel route that preserves the single track portion of trail 500 may be considered at that time.
Greg Beardslee	Gallatin Ridge Riders Contact - Gallatin Valley Bicycle Club	1785		I am in favor of allowing ATVs all the way to the Flathead Pass road. But they will need to be controlled during hunting season.	Fairy lake	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 7M proposes to allow ATV's on the Carroll Creek Road #75 from June 15 - December 2. This configuration is to facilitate some motorized access in the Fairy Lake area during hunting season. Most of the remaining trails in the area that are proposed to be open to motorized vehicles would have a season of June 15 - Oct. 15. in the preferred alternative.
Bruce Brock		1208		Fairy Lake - new winter plan closes all play areas, is only a trail in and out. I see no way to groom through Sec. 26. Allow play in all that is playable. No travel down into Frazer Lake, or, if so, none above 8500 feet, where goats would be.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Doug Chabot		1229		I would like to see snowmobiling open from Fairy Lake to Ross Peak. Basically its the proposal that Jim Early presented to Jose Castro. BUT I'd like to see the Big Bump/Flatiron/Nyanuki Bowl area remain open. This area is a deservedly popular riding area. There's lots of terrain for skiers and riders to play side by side. The skiers will still have unmotorized	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				access in areas south and north of Bridger Bowl and the entire Frazier Lake area as well as the terrain south of Flathead Pass. keeping this area open to snowmobilers seems like a good compromise.		snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 541 - Fairy Lake - Motorized - Summer and winter leave open - This area is great for the family, beautiful lake for fishing.	Fairy Lake	There is no trail 541 in the Fairy Lake area. If you are referring to trail #540 - the Shafthouse Trail, this trail is proposed to be managed as closed to motorized use in the preferred alternative, to provide a non-motorized trail opportunity close to Fairy Lake, as several other routes are proposed to be open to motorized use.
Duane Halverson		271	Townsend	Snowmobiles, snowborders and skiers use snowmobiles to get into a number of areas around Fairy Lake and Frazier Lake. With the access blocked off as previously stated, I would recommend that the closed sec 26,36 & 2, east of the ridges between Fairy Lake and Ross Peak remain open for cross country travel allowing recreational use from trailhead #743 to Fairly Lake campground at trailend #74. I am scratching my head as to why sec 22 at Fairy Lake and Sec 16- Frazier Lake are closed since it is mostly rock, ice, snow. These should also be open, but the previously mentioned area are important for contiguous access.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
John Preston		767	Bozeman	Skiers and high marking snowmobiliers need to be separated because riders can totally "consume" slopes in an amazingly short amount of time, not to mention the noise impact they have on other receptionists. I would like to see snowmobiliers restricted to existing roads in the north Bridgers, especially the Flat Irons. Wildlife, including wolverine and lynx populations would also benefit from this restriction.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Brent Smith		979	Livingston	All areas north of Ross Peak should remain open to snowmobiling. Snowmobiling has very little effect on the environment. They are cleaner and quieter than they have ever been.	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your comment. Many people provided a variety of configurations for winter management in the Bridgers, many of which were considered in the final proposal. The Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative balances the needs of wintering wildlife with providing non-motorized opportunities for popular ski destinations, as well as opportunities for challenge backcountry snowmobiling, and marked/groomed snowmobile trails. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.
Jay Pape	Bozeman Area	681	Bozeman	SEE MAP In the event that a plan similar to this is adopted, the	Fairy Lake	Thank you for your offer. Implementing the new travel plan will be more successful with involvement from local

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Backcountry Skiers			local ski community recognizes that management of these boundaries will be a considerable challenge for the FS. With that in mind, the backcountry ski community is willing to help pay for signage and place appropriate boundary markers where needed. You can count on our help.		clubs and organizations.
Jay O'Neill		1109	Livingston	I have been riding in Rock Creek since the seventies. It is an advanced ride that not all riders can take. My son is advanced enough to ride into Rams Horn Lake and to Windy Pass. My daughters are not and this area will be closed prior to their becoming able to ride into this area. They will never see the views from Eagle Head Mountain at 10,000 feet in the winter. The views from the divide are breath taking and it saddens me that they will no longer be enjoyed in the winter.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to allow snowmobiles in a corridor between Rock Creek and Windy Pass. Please see the winter maps. Please see the Record of Decision for the final description of snowmobiling opportunities in the Gallatin Range.
Paul Herbel		927	Bozeman	Cabin Creek area needs to open and close at the same dates for all the trails in that area to maintain continuity and reduce confusion. The Gallatin Crest trail provides a long ride from Hyalite Peak to Tepee Creek. Cutting it off from Windy Pass south is a mistake. There needs to be opportunity for motorcyclists to get away from the hiking and horseback riding public and this one area provides me that. There is no one up there once you get away from Hyalite Lake or Windy Pass. The Gallatin Crest trail down to #299 Ramshorn Lake needs to stay open to provide trail miles away from horses and hikers and to provide emergency exits should they be needed. Squaw Creek #417 is a most enjoyable trail to ride on as it allows access to the north end of the Crest trail w/out having to go up to Hyalite Reservoir. It disperses user groups.	Gallatin Crest	In the preferred alternative, a more consistent date regime was identified for motorized trails opening and closing in the Cabin Creek area. Several of the routes you discuss in your comments would be open to motorcycles in Alternative 7M. The configuration you propose was considered in Alternatives 1-4. Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives. The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Michael Lebwohl		943	Gallatin Gateway	The Gallatin Crest trail runs through almost the middle of the Hyalite Porcupine-Buffalo Horn WSA. Sound cascades down from this ridge in all directions. Modern motorcycles run at a volume of 90-100 decibels. This sound can carry from the ridge to the boundaries of the WSA. The crest should be non-motorized. The south end of the trail runs into YNP. By eliminating access to this area you will help the Park avoid encroachment by motorized vehicles. The Grizzly Bear recovery area	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 considered managing all of the trails within the HPBH as non-motorized. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to provide quiet non-motorized

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				should be off limits to motorized.		recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat. The State of Montana requires that all motorcycles, including trail bikes, have mufflers that muffle sound to a decibel limit of 70 dbA measured at 50 feet. Please see the Noise analysis in Chapter 3 for more discussion.
Dean Littlepage/ Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Assn	952	Bozeman	Reconstruct and reroute the Wheeler Gulch trail #169 as a Montana Wilderness Assn "Adopt-a-Trail" project. The trail is unmaintained and rarely used now.	Gallatin Crest	Thank you for this information about the Wheeler Gulch trail system. Your information will be useful in prioritizing future maintenance and reconstruction projects. The travel plan is designed to address what the appropriate uses of trails and roads are in the future, but does not generally address current maintenance issues. The travel plan decision will describe the "desired future condition" in terms of what specific uses we intend to manage road and trails for. By clearly defining what uses are appropriate on what routes, our maintenance and reconstruction efforts will now be tailored to provide the best facility for those activities. Most facility management issues will be addressed through site specific plans for maintenance or reconstruction at another time and are not addressed in this decision.
John and Jamie Parker		958	Bozeman	Gallatin Crest should be non-motorized. We enjoy our national forests as a place to seek solitude. How many places in the world can you go to listen for the distant call of a pine grosbeak… We want to listen to the character of the red squirrel of just the winter wind.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 considered managing the Crest trail as non-motorized. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5 to provide quality motorized single track riding on a historically used route. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to provide quiet non-motorized recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat.
Norman Weeden		994	Bozeman	The Gallatin Crest should be non-motorized b/c 1) water quality (oil and gas spills) 2) soil and trail erosion (trails up to and along the crest are not built for the heavy impact of motorized vehicles) and 3) noise aesthetics (individuals involved in quiet uses can often accept noise from below, but noise from above will nearly always ruin the experience being sought)	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 considered managing the Crest trail as non-motorized. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5 to provide quality motorized single track riding on a historically used route. The remainder of the year, all of the trails within the HPBH would be closed to wheeled motorized vehicles. The Crest trail south of the Moose Ck. (# 187) junction to the Yellowstone Park boundary would be managed for foot and stock travel to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						provide quiet non-motorized recreation opportunities and to protect grizzly bear core habitat.
Rick Meis		1030	Bozeman	Gallatin Crest: Limit the size to the size of motorcycle that was used at the time S393 was passed as law and put a limit to the number of motorcycles to reflect the usage at that time.	Gallatin Crest	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Anne Banks	BWAGS	1177	Bozeman	The decision to exclude motorcycles from Big Creek and the trails branching from it to the Gallatin Crest and to close a large portion of the crest south of Windy Pass is a good step; however closing the	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 considered managing all of the trails within the HPBH as non-motorized. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				entire crest from Hyalite trailhead to the Yellowstone National Park boundary is preferable: closure would protect a large intact area as relatively primitive and isolated, and user conflicts and resource damage would be greatly reduced.		near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5. Wheeled vehicle travel on proposed open motorcycle routes would be prohibited the remainder of the year. This alternative provides high quality single track motorcycle opportunities that were occurring at the time of designation, but does not allow motorcycle use to accrete to all routes within the HPBH, thus preserving existing wilderness character. Large blocks of the HPBH would be managed for non-motorized primitive recreation opportunities under the preferred alternative.
Anne Banks	BWAGS	1177	Bozeman	Because Windy Pass trail # 82 is the most convenient motorcycle access to/exit from the north segment of the Gallatin Crest trail # 96, closing # 96 south of Windy Pass to motorcycles will put even more pressure on the heavily used #82 i.e. motorcycles can't continue south to exit at Porcupine or other trails, so must turn either turnaround and retrace their tracks or exit at #82. Closure of #82 to motorcycles on weekends, though helpful from safety/user conflict standpoint, will be difficult to enforce. The best solution is simply to close the entire WSA, especially the crest, to motorcycle use.	Gallatin Crest	Based on comments we received during the DEIS review, we concur that motorcycle traffic on Trail #82 could become congested. To address this concern, and to minimize conflicts with hikers, the preferred alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest Trail #96 from Hyalite south to the junction with Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - September 5. The remainder of the Crest to the south (including Windy Pass #82) would be managed as closed yearlong to wheeled motor vehicles. Alternative 6 explored the option of managing all trails within the HPBH as closed to motorized travel. Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for route specific information.
Ky Hanson		56	Belgrade	Consider open a summer use single track trail making it possible to ride motorcycles onto the crest trail from Ramshorn Lake.	Gallatin Crest	Your recommendation was considered in Alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative would allow motorcycle access to Ramshorn Lake (the Porcupine/Buffalo Horn loop), but would not allow motorcycles on the Crest south of Windy Pass. Please see the summer motorized maps for Alternative 7M.
Charles Kraft		62	Bozeman	I just heard that snowmobiles did not use Portal Creek in the past. A friend and I and our families used it a lot from early 1970 on. We have pictures to prove we were at Windy Pass Ranger Station both summer and winter.	Gallatin Crest	Our own historic documentation, and documentation provided to Congress during hearings about the Wilderness Study Act legislation support that snowmobiling in Portal was ongoing in the 1970's. We have taken this into account when considering the appropriateness of snowmobiling in the Portal Ck. portion of the HPBH.
Chris Anderson		102	Bozeman	Gallatin Crest - If you have to accept alt 7 at least modify the winter travel to allow snowmobiling in the upper drainages (Gallatin Crest, North and Hyalite Trails #434, E. Fork Hyalite & #427 Hyalite). Snowmobiling is the best use of the upper bowls.	Gallatin Crest	Balancing winter uses in the Hyalite area proved to be very challenging. Alternatives 1-3 evaluated managing the "high country" of the Hyalite area for snowmobiling. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to access the Grotto Falls Trailhead and

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						East Fork to provide access to Heather/Emerald Basin, ice climbing and rental cabins. The bulk of the Hyalite drainage including Hyalite Creek and Peak area would be managed as closed to snowmobiles to provide high quality non-motorized recreation opportunities. Please see the Record of Decision and Decision maps for the final winter configuration in Hyalite.
Catherine Weeden		1604		There is no attempt apparent in the DEIS to limit motorcycle travel to the levels of 1977 or even to evaluate the effects of the increase on wilderness character - despite the Congressional manage and the recent interpretation found in the Interim Directive, 23292b.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M would provide motorcycle opportunities that are well within the range of opportunities available in 1977. In 1977, approximately 188 miles of trail were open to motorcycling, the preferred alternative would manage 68 miles as open to motorcycling. This decrease was designed to improve secure grizzly bear core area, and provide large blocks of the WSA for non-motorized recreation opportunities, improving wilderness character in many locations. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness and Wilderness Study Areas for an extensive comparison of alternatives, effects to wilderness character, and an assessment of compliance with laws, regulations, and policy.
Catherine Weeden		1604		In addition to prohibited motorized use on the Crest, motorcycles should not be allowed on trails #185 or #186. These trails go straight into some of the wildest areas of the WSA. Likewise, it is inappropriate to have motorcycle traffic on the Porcupine Trail #34 and its branches, #66, #199, and #160.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 considered managing all of the trails within the HPBH as non-motorized. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative, would allow motorcycles on the Crest trail from Hyalite to the Moose Ck. Trail junction near Windy Pass from July 15 - Sept. 5. Motorcycles would also be allowed on trails 185, 186, 66, 199 and 160 (the Porcupine Buffalo Horn loop). Wheeled vehicle travel on proposed open motorcycle routes would be prohibited the remainder of the year. This alternative provides high quality single track motorcycle opportunities that were occurring at the time of designation, but does not allow motorcycle use to accrete to all routes within the HPBH, thus preserving existing wilderness character. Large blocks of the HPBH would be managed for non-motorized primitive recreation opportunities under the preferred alternative. Please see the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.
Kerry White		1616		Portal Creek is a favorite snowmobile area. We climb up windy pass and to the top of Eagle Head Mtn. From the top we just stand and look as you can see nine mountain ranges from this point.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to allow snowmobiling in the Windy Pass/Eagle Head Mountain area. Please see the winter map for Alternative 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Remove the motorcycle trails with the WSA: This potential can be met by the removal of motorcycles from Windy Pass Trail #82, NW Gallatin Trails, Gallatin Crest Trail in its entirety, East Fork Hyalite #434, Hyalite #427, Porcupine Buffalo Core Trails #1, 199, 466, Porcupine Creek Trail #34, Teepee Creek #39, Hidden Lake Divide Trail #66 south, Wilson Draw Trail #161 in the WSA.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 evaluated managing the trails in the WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M would manage several of the historically used routes as open to motorcycles. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Jay O'Neill		1109		Please reconsider taking the Gallatin Crest away from us. It is too beautiful to close up to a select few.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Portal Creek: This is the passage to Windy Pass from the other side of the Gallatin Crest.		Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail would be managed for foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities. See the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Crest Trail #96 July 15 opening date (and feeder trails Sqaw #185, Moose #187, Swan #186) Motorcyclists would prefer to see these opening dates moved back to June 15 or at the latest July 1. The feeder trails and the vast majority of the Crest trail are typically melted out and ready for use by June 15. July 15 is such a late opening date that there is fear that these trails may not be available to motorcyclists in drought years due to Fire Restrictions which typically go into effect around the same time.	Gallatin Crest	Our proposed dates for opening trails within the HPBH in the preferred alternative are still July 15. Many of the trails lead to high elevation locations where snow blocks the trail well into July, the 15th is typically the earliest that the high elevation north slopes are snow free and not susceptible to damage. Lower elevations are important ungulate calving areas, where motorized travel can be detrimental. Fire restrictions that eliminate trail vehicles are rare, and typically only last a short time when implemented.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Using the natural terrain boundaries as the boundary lines for snowmobile closure in the Portal Creek Crest area (this is the area North and East of Windy Pass). We discussed the fact that this area was being used by snowmobiles prior to 1977 and therefore qualifies for continued use.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M would allow snowmobile travel across Windy Pass, through to South Rock. Terrain boundaries were used to describe where closures would be employed. Please see the Record of Decision and Decision maps for the final configuration of snowmobile opportunities in the HPBH.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Crest Trail #96 - Absolutely the most important section of trail in the Livingston Ranger District to Single Track Motorcycle Riders. Leaving this section of trail open would alleviate potential conflicts of use in the Bozeman District (prevents motorcycles from having to drop into the more populated low country to cross thru zone). Motorcycle use on this section of trail has not & will not take away from the potential wilderness character of this area.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail would be managed for foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities. See the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.
Pat Simmons	Sierra Club	1545		Allowing motorcycles, or any motorized traffic along the Gallatin Crest Trail #96 and trails feeding into the Gallatin Crest Trail is inconsistent with the tenets of good forest protection. Even though motorcycle travel is limited to a short period of time (July 16 - Sep. 4) that is also the prime hiking period.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 evaluated managing the trails in the WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M would manage several of the historically used routes as open to motorcycles. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Brian Sobrepena		1557	Bozeman	Please leave open to dirtbikes - the Gallatin Crest is a very special area - I've been using this trail for many years. It gets me up to an elevation where I can see and remember I live in an awesome place. The Crest means a lot to us people who truly use this trail.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail would be managed for foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities. See the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.
John Vehrs		1595	Bozeman	Hyalite trailhead to Levrich Canyon - please leave open to motorcycles. Includes Levrich Canyon Trailhead, Hyalite Trailhead, Crest Trail #96, Tepee Creek Trailhead #39, and create a single track motorcycle route from Sage Creek trailhead to the	Gallatin Crest	The configuration you suggest was analyzed in alternatives 1-3. Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail would be managed for

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Red Canyon trailhead.		foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities. Alternative 7M provides motorcycle access south from the Gallatin range on the Buffalo Horn trail, crossing the Hwy at Cinnamon, then heading south through the Taylor Fork on the Buck Ck. road, where the trail would then connect with the Oil well road, providing access through Cabin Creek to the Red Canyon trailhead. Please see the summer motorized map for Alternative 7m.
Derrick C. Monson		1031	Belgrade	Closing the Gallatin Crest puts snowmobilers in a lower area that receives less snow, has more trees and has more wildlife. Snowmobile travel in the higher areas that receive much more snow and have much less wildlife only makes sense.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M would allow snowmobile travel across Windy Pass, through to South Rock. This change from alternative 7 in the DEIS was largely driven in response to comment from snowmobilers that indicated this is a historically used high quality backcountry snowmobile area. Please see the Record of Decision and Decision maps for the final configuration of snowmobile opportunities in the Gallatin Range.
Nike G. Stevens		1046		Snowmobiles should not be permitted in Alpine areas and a ridges where snow is limited by wind. On ridges and above tree line areas often insufficient snow cover to protect the vegetation and snowmobiles cause serious damage to plants and wildlife habitats	Gallatin Crest	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Paul D. Herbel		1330	Bozeman	I ride on Sunday. How can I get off the southern end of the Crest Trail if the route out is closed to motorized on weekends.	Gallatin Crest	The comment in the DEIS about restricting motorcycle travel on Trail #82 on weekends was an error, and was noted in an errata sheet posted on the website. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative would route motorcycles off the Crest on the Moose Creek Trail #187, before Windy Pass. Trail 82 will be managed for foot and stock travel under this alternative, as would the Crest Trail south of the Moose Ck. Trail junction.
Paul D. Herbel		1330		The Gallatin Crest Trail provides a long ride from Hyalite Peak to Trespass Creek. Cutting it off from Windy Pass south is a mistake. There needs to be opportunity for motorcyclists to get away from the hiking and horseback riding public and this one area provides me that. There is no-one up there once you	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail would be managed for foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				get away from Hyalite Lake or Windy Pass Cabin.		provide non-motorized recreation opportunities. See the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.
Paul D. Herbel		1330		Closing trail #82 on weekends to bikes is all wrong. How will I get off the Crest on a Sunday if there is no way out to the south?	Gallatin Crest	The comment in the DEIS about restricting motorcycle travel on Trail #82 on weekends was an error, and was noted in an errata sheet posted on the website. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative would route motorcycles off the Crest on the Moose Creek Trail #187, before Windy Pass. Trail 82 will be managed for foot and stock travel under this alternative, as would the Crest Trail south of the Moose Ck. Trail junction.
Paul D. Herbel		1330		The Gallatin Crest Trail down to #299 Ramshorn Lake needs to stay open to provide trail miles away from horses and hikers and to provide emergency exists should they be needed.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail would be managed for foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities. See the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.
Paul D. Herbel		1330		I want future generations to be able to ride the Crest Trail from one end to the other as I have for so many years. The trail looks the same as it did in the 1970s.	Gallatin Crest	The configuration you suggest was analyzed in alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail would be managed for foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Squaw Creek Trail 185: this trail also accesses the Gallatin Crest and it is of equal importance for continued motorized use. Your proposal opening day of July 15 is too late you are dates proposed will allow access to this trail for less than two months.	Gallatin Crest	Storm Castle Trail #185 would be managed as open to motorcycles in the preferred alternative 7M. Our proposed dates for opening trails to motorized use within the HPBH in the preferred alternative are still July 15. Many of the trails lead to high elevation locations where snow blocks the trail well into July, the 15th is typically the earliest that the high elevation north slopes are snow free and not susceptible to damage. Lower elevations are important ungulate calving areas, where motorized travel in early summer can be detrimental.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Goose Creek Trail 187 and Swan Creek Trail 186: all of these trails in the Gallatin Crest North West area (185, 186, 187, 82) can sustain two wheeled motorized use earlier in the season and should remain open until two weeks before the rifle hunting season opens (October 15).	Gallatin Crest	Our proposed dates for opening trails to motorized use within the HPBH in the preferred alternative are still July 15. Many of the trails lead to high elevation locations where snow blocks the trail well into July, the 15th is typically the earliest that the high elevation north slopes are snow free and not susceptible to damage. Lower

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						elevations are important ungulate calving areas, where motorized travel in early summer can be detrimental.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Windy Pass trail 82: opening and closing dates are too restrictive enclosures on the weekends are unacceptable.	Gallatin Crest	Our proposed dates for opening trails to motorized use within the HPBH in the preferred alternative are still July 15. Many of the trails lead to high elevation locations where snow blocks the trail well into July, the 15th is typically the earliest that the high elevation north slopes are snow free and not susceptible to damage. Lower elevations are important ungulate calving areas, where motorized travel in early summer can be detrimental. The comment in the DEIS about restricting motorcycle travel on Trail #82 on weekends was an error, and was noted in an errata sheet posted on the website.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Gallatin Crest North 96 segment one: you are opening and closing dates are far too restrictive for a normal precipitation year. This trail in combination with 96 south is crucial for many connections and looping opportunities in the forest.	Gallatin Crest	Our proposed dates for opening trails to motorized use within the HPBH in the preferred alternative are still July 15. Many of the trails lead to high elevation locations where snow blocks the trail well into July, the 15th is typically the earliest that the high elevation north slopes are snow free and not susceptible to damage. Lower elevations are important ungulate calving areas, where motorized travel in early summer can be detrimental.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Gallatin Crest South 96 Segment two: this section of trail connects all of the 96 North trails to the southern end of the forest system trails. It is of the utmost importance to keep open to single-track motorized use. This trail will also keep a lot of traffic off the lower elevations system trails therefore eliminating a lot of conflict of users closer to trailheads.	Gallatin Crest	The configuration you suggest was analyzed in alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail would be managed for foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		This area is accessed by snowmobiles from four different trailhead. Rock Creek, portal Creek (Windy Pass), Tom Miner, and Buffalo Horn. The natural terrain boundaries limit the riding area but it provides excellent snowmobiling for many experience levels. It also provides the only access for open country above the tree line snowmobiling south of Livingston before Yellowstone National Park. This area also relieves pressure from other heavily used areas in the Gallatin Canyon, mainly Buck Ridge and Carrot Basin.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to allow snowmobiles in a corridor between Rock Creek and Windy Pass. Please see the winter maps. The Big Sky Trail from Buffalo Horn to Portal Creek would also be managed as a designated snowmobile trail in a closed area (no off route travel). Please see the Record of Decision for the final description of snowmobiling opportunities in the Gallatin Range.
Eva Patten and Patti Steinmuller	BWAGs	467	Bozeman	We support the recommendation that the section from Windy Pass cabin over Eaglehead Mountain	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 evaluated managing the trails in the WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M would manage

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				and south to Ramshorn Lake be non-motorized. Parts of this trail are very fragile and contain petrified wood. We believe the Gallatin Crest Trail in its entirety should be non-motorized to protect fragile natural resources and to reduce user conflicts.		several of the historically used routes as open to motorcycles. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Marlene Renwyck		496	Livingston	We feel that the entire Gallatin Crest trail should be closed to motorized use to prevent illegal use from an open drainage to a restricted drainage.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 evaluated managing the trails in the WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M would manage several of the historically used routes as open to motorcycles. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301		While we commend the Forest Service for closing trails 159, 177, 181, 190, 196 and 225 to ATV and motorcycle use, we believe the Forest Service should complete its efforts and designate the entire Gallatin Crest trail as nonmotorized, as reflected in the 1987 Forest Plan, when the trail was designated	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 evaluated managing the trails in the WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M would manage several of the historically used routes as open to motorcycles. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				a National Recreation Trail.		in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301		If the Forest Service is intent on keeping the Gallatin Crest trail open to motorcycles, GYC suggests issuing special use permits for those who wish to ride the Crest by motorcycle.	Gallatin Crest	Permitting use within the HPBH was a concept briefly discussed, but not considered in any detail. We believe with the low volume of motorcycle use observed at this time, that wilderness character can be preserved through careful route configuration, and seasonal restrictions. Future management of all uses in the Study Area may need to reconsider managing the volume of use to protect wilderness character at some point.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301		GYC fully supports the forest services proposal for Teepee Creek 39 trail. This area provides important habitat for grizzly bears, elk and wolves. Teepee Creek is also an adjacent to Yellowstone National Park and should be managed for nonmotorized used to help in motorized trespass potential into Yellowstone.	Gallatin Crest	The preferred alternative would manage the Tepee Cr Trail #39 as closed to motorized use year round.
Patricia Brandon		739		Moose Creek Trail 187 to Gallatin Crest is a beautiful trail for bikes and not heavily used and is needed to complete a loop trail.	Gallatin Crest	This trail would open to mountain bikes and motorcycles in the preferred alternative.
Patricia Brandon		739		Gallatin Crest Trail needs to remain open at the entire length for motorcycles. This will provide several points where cyclists can stop and returned by a different route.	Gallatin Crest	The configuration you suggest was analyzed in alternatives 1-4. Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail would be managed for foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities.
Jane Jarrett		751	Livingston	I support limiting all-terrain (ATVs) and motorcycles in the Wilderness Study Area plus support closing the area north of Ramshorn Lake along Windy Pass to Hyalite Peak to snowmobiles. The noise plus exhaust pollution is detrimental to wildlife plus backcountry skiers.	Gallatin Crest	The preferred alternative 7M would prohibit ATV's on all routes, and restrict motorcycles to a subset of the trails within the WSA for an open riding season from July 15-Sept 5. Snowmobiling would be confined to the Big Sky Trail, and open areas in Heather Emerald, and between Windy Pass and Rock Creek. The decision for the winter configuration in the HPBH was very challenging. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration for winter use in the HPBH and rationale for that decision.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Gallatin Crest Trail #96: We appreciate the designation of the trail south of Windy Pass as motor free, but the entire trail should be managed as motor free because the trail traverses the core of the WSA, where wild land values must prevail. With the extensive network and pattern of motorcycle trails as proposed, it is virtually impossible for a quiet trail user to take a significant trip on the Gallatin Crest without traveling on motorized trails. We find this to be a serious flaw in the plan that is supposed to be maintaining wilderness character. It seems obvious that with no limits on the numbers of motorized users on these trails, a quiet trail user is far less likely to have a wilderness quality experience in the core of	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 evaluated managing the trails in the WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M would manage several of the historically used routes as open to motorcycles. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the WSA today than in 1977.		managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Hyalite Trail #427 and Eastfork Hyalite Trail #434: these two trails, which are almost entirely within the WSA comment or two of the most popular trails on the Forest for non-motorized use. The proposal to designate both for motorcycle use for the next 15 to 20 years is clearly in conflict with current uses. Trail 434, from a motorcyclist point of view, is not even a very attractive opportunity, as it is a short, dead-end trail. In addition, trail 427 is the northern access to the Gallatin Crest, the core area of the WSA. To alleviate user conflict and maintain WSA values and experiences, both trails should be motor free.	Gallatin Crest	The preferred alternative 7M would manage these two routes as open to motorcycles from July 15 - Sept. 5. Additionally, the Forest Supervisor has been considering managing these routes under a "time share" scenario where they would be closed to motorized uses on certain days of the week during the open season. Please see the Record of Decision for detailed discussions about the time share concept. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		South Cottonwood Trail #422 and Blackmore Trail #423: the portion of the trails within the WSA, should not be open to mountain bikes, consistent with the designation of the trails as non-motorized and the fact that bicycles were not in use in the area in 1977. In the two trails were a subject of the 2004 in negotiations between MWA, in coalition with the Friends of the Gallatin Forest, and Gallatin Valley Bicycle Club and other mountain bike groups. It was agreed that where these two trails fall within the WSA, they should be managed as hiking and horseback riding trails, with a reconstructed/rerouted Wheeler Gulch Trail #169, as MWA is proposing to the Forest Service, providing more opportunities as	Gallatin Crest	While we agree that mountain bikes were not likely using these trails in 1977, we do believe that mountain bike use ongoing today can be accommodated and still maintain wilderness character. Alternative 7M proposes to allow mountain bikes on these routes. Please see the Record of Decision for detailed discussions about the rationale for this proposal.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				he trail open to all non-motorized uses, including mountain bikes. This combination of designations provide significant "front country" opportunity in the lower South Cottonwood drainage, outside the WSA, while maintaining the wild character, wildlife habitat comment and opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation in the upper drainage, within the WSA. A good cut off point for bicycles would be the Fox Creek Cabin, allowing people who have reserved the cabin to bring their gear in on bikes if they choose, and then hike from there.		
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		The proposed a motorcycle trail on the Gallatin Crest significantly diminishes the value of the intact, motor free Big Creek watershed (trail #180 and connecting trails). There are several possibilities for non-motorized loop trail trips from the Big Creek Trailhead, but the most significant and attractive loops involve travel on segments of the motorized Gallatin Crest Trail from Windy Pass north. The necessity of traveling a motorized trail for a portion of an otherwise outstanding wild land trip is a major impact on the wilderness character of the Big Creek motor free zone, and therefore on the WSA as a whole, since motor free areas are so rare in the WSA under the preferred alternative.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 evaluated managing the trails in the WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M would manage several of the historically used routes as open to motorcycles. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Kathleen Murphy		1451		I would request mechanical vehicle closure on would be Seven Falls Trail to the Hyalite Lake, Emerald Lake Trail, Swan Creek, Windy Pass Trail and the trail up to Buffalo Horn pass. The first two in particular are incredibly popular hiking trails and the presence of both motorcycles and mountain bikes is actually dangerous to the many people that use these trails daily. Bikes of any kind do not belong on these very popular hiking trails. The other trails would give quiet access into the glorious Gallatin Crest, which without a doubt should be given true Wilderness status. It needs to be protected now. Motorcycles do not belong on fragile alpine meadows carving trails through the soil and disturbing the quiet and beauty for miles.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 evaluated managing the trails in the WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M would manage several of the historically used routes as open to motorcycles. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Chris Naumann		1454		Specifically regarding Alternative 7 for the Southern Gallatin in summer: Motorcycle access to the northern segment of the Gallatin Crest should begin at Swan Creek Trail #185 to Hyalite Lake (Hyalite Lake Trail #427 should be designated non-motorized). The southern-most motorcycle access should be First Creek (?) Trail #66 to Windy Pass. Trail #46 and #199 should be closed to all motorized use. Trail #34 and all trails up the Porcupine Creek drainage should be closed to all motorized use. Trail #1 and #160 and all trails up the Buffalo Horn drainage should be closed to all motorized used. Trail #120 and all the trails up the Tom Miner basin beyond the campground should be closed to all motorized use. Prohibiting all motorized use on these trails in the southern portion of the study would provide a large section of "wilderness" around Eaglehead, Ramshorn, Lone Indian peaks. Considering this area's proximity to Yellowstone national Park, I think this would provide good balance with allowing some motorcycle use in the northern part of the study area.	Gallatin Crest	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						within the HPBH.
Joe Polus		1487		We discussed keeping the Crest to Big Creek to Rock Creek to the Crest trails open to motorcycle use as a loop opportunity. These trails are shown as open on Alt 2 so it would be a possibility to open them on final decision. This is a high, back country loop that would allow motorcycle use to take place with very little to no interactions with other user groups (conflict reduction). Motorcyclists have maintained and would continue to maintain these trails for all users.	Gallatin Crest	The preferred alternative would provide motorcycle opportunities concentrated from Hyalite along the Crest south to the Moose Creek Trail junction #187) and on the Porcupine and Buffalo Horn loop system. Please see the summer motorized maps for alternative 7M. This system was designed to provide high quality historically used motorcycle loops, while providing significant areas for non-motorized recreation and to improve grizzly bear habitat in the southern end of the Gallatin Range.
Joe Polus		1487		Gallatin Crest - Adjustment of northern closure boundary to the Natural Terrain boundary around the Sentinel Mountain would virtually eliminate enforcement issues. Rock Creek access is the most important access to local Livingston snowmobilers (most highly valued access). Snowmobilers support and will help fund establishment of a parking area on GNF property in the Rock Creek drainage.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M would allow snowmobile travel across Windy Pass, through to South Rock. Terrain boundaries were used to describe where closures would be employed. Please see the Record of Decision and Decision maps for the final configuration of snowmobile opportunities in the HPBH.
Alaina Lammer Knight		629		Do not allow motorized traffic in the Hyalite-Porcupine-Buffalo Horn WSA. Disallow motorcycles on the Gallatin Crest (which is the only NS corridor between Yellowstone NP and the Bridgers) and other trails in the WSA.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 evaluated managing the trails in the WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M would manage several of the historically used routes as open to motorcycles. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Alaina Lammer Knight		629		Ban snowmobiles from the approximately 15 miles of the Big Sky snowmobile trail that are in the WSA. Move the WSA corridor linking Paradise Valley and Hwy 191 that intrudes at the southern end of the WSA. This is critical habitat for many species including grizzly bear.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 considers managing the entire WSA as closed to motorized uses year long. The
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		The South Cottonwood Trail #422 and Blackmore Trail #423 should be designated as entirely motor free, both the portions inside and outside the WSA.	Gallatin Crest	Both of these trails are proposed to be managed as non-motorized year round in the preferred alternative.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		The proposed motorcycle trail on the Gallatin Crest significantly diminishes the value of the intact, motor-free Big Creek watershed (Trail #180 and the connecting trails). This is a remote and spectacular drainage and functions as a true wilderness.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 evaluated managing the trails in the WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M would manage several of the historically used routes as open to motorcycles. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		If motorcycles are to be allowed in the WSA, we support the plan to limit their use to the period from July 15 to September 5, and to close the Windy Pass trail to motorcycles on weekends. This would ease some of the problems created by motorized use during the fragile spring and fall seasons.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail and the Windy Pass Trail #82 would be managed for foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities.
Steven Gehman		662		For the Gallatin Crest area, I believe that the travel planning process represents an opportunity for the Forest Service to meet the mandate of Congress and preserve the wilderness qualities of the Hyalite-Porcupine-Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area; all alternatives for this area should exclude motorized uses.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 evaluated managing the trails in the WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M would manage several of the historically used routes as open to motorcycles. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Thomas B. Wells		553	Bozeman	I recently returned from a July 4th hike from Tom Miner Basin to Hyalite via Ramshorn Lake and the Devil's Backbone trail. The continued use of this area, including Trail 96 by motorized in summer or winter should not be permitted. We documented damage by motorcycles to high alpine tundra and saw tracks of high pointing snowmobiles in the headwaters of Lewis Creek and Cliff Creek. We saw ATV gouges on the Seven Falls Trail. We also observed widening of the Tom Miner trail by ATVs in the first mile.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 evaluated managing the trails in the WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M would manage several of the historically used routes as open to motorcycles. ATV's would not be permitted on any trails in the study area under this alternative. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Thomas B. Wells		553		Windy Pass - Motorcyclists do not currently observe the seasonal closure. We saw evidence of motorcycle use on July 4. The area was too wet for them to be there. The idea of a weekend closure is nice but only if there will be continual enforcement.	Gallatin Crest	There are currently no seasonal restrictions on the Windy Pass Trail. The travel plan preferred alternative would manage this trail as closed to summer motorized use.
Catherine R. Brandon		584		The Gallatin Crest North trails 434 and 427 should be open for motorized traffic and foot only traffic only. There is 10 miles of trails for non-motorized to one mile of motorized traffic. One or two trails in the whole Gallatin Range is not too much to ask for.	Gallatin Crest	Trails 434 and 427 are proposed to be open to motorcycles, bicycles, foot and stock travel in the preferred alternative from July 15 - Sept. 5. Additionally, we are considering a "time share" use of these trails where during the open motorized season, mountain bikes and motorcycles would be restricted on these trails during certain days of the week or some like configuration. Please see the Record of Decision for a

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						complete discussion on the "time share" concept, and its rationale.
Noreen Breeding		454		For trails #434 and #437, Alt 7 is completely unworkable. Emphasizing hiking, biking, horse riding, and motorcycle use on narrow, winding forest rails is a recipe for user conflict and trail destruction. Voluntary alternating days of use will never work because users are not accustomed to planning ahead for day trips and may not be able to adjust their schedules.	Gallatin Crest	Trails 434 and 427 are proposed to be open to motorcycles, bicycles, foot and stock travel in the preferred alternative from July 15 - Sept. 5. Additionally, we are considering a "time share" use of these trails where during the open motorized season, mountain bikes and motorcycles would be restricted on these trails during certain days of the week or some like configuration. Please see the Record of Decision for a complete discussion on the "time share" concept, and its rationale.
Quint Gidley		1799		The proposed closures to mountain bikes of the Cliff Creek and Cabin Creek trails off of the Hyalite Divide will eliminate any single track loop options off the divide for mountain bikes. Currently there is hardly any traffic of any kind on these trails so; I see little reason for closing them. Once again, until this area is deemed wilderness it should remain open to bikes.	Gallatin Crest	Alternatives 1-4 considered allowing mountain bikes on these routes. In the preferred alternative 7M they would be closed to mountain bikes to provide non-mechanized recreation opportunities, and to preserve wilderness character.
Stanley D. Cook		1855	Manhattan	Summer motorized in the Gallatin Crest area should continue to allow ATV and motorcycle use from the Portal Creek Trailhead up trail 194 to its junction with trail 66 from Hidden Lakes. 194 has historically been used as 4-wheeler trail. It follows an old logging road toward Golden Trout Lakes then splits off to the right. The trail follows well inside the edge of a rocky cliff to flat meadows at the upper portion where it joins trail 66. It is stable and does not present an erosion problem. Only the very end of the trail passes into the WSA which makes it a viable opportunity as a grandfathered ATV route.	Gallatin Crest	All trails within the HPBH were single track routes at the time of designation, and were not being used by jeeps. In order to be consistent with the Montana Wilderness Study Act, and current Agency policy on the management of motorized vehicles in wilderness study areas, ATV's would be prohibited on all trails within the WSA under the preferred alternative.
Jeffrey J. Holman		1859	Manhattan	The crest rail cuts out many miles of trail between Ramshorn Lake and Windy Pass. Why? The more trail systems you shut down, the more crowded another system will become and therefore more damage because of overuse.	Gallatin Crest	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The fact that the season for motorcycles is quite short and closes Sept. 15, coupled with the plan to	Gallatin Crest	Thank you for pointing out this discrepancy. It has been fixed in the FEIS and the Record of Decision. Alternative

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				close Windy Pass (82) to motorcycles on weekends, provides a very reasonable balance between motorized and non-motorized users. The rationale section closes motorcycle use Sept. 15 but the detailed description section closes motorcycle use Sept. 5.		7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail and the Windy Pass Trail #82 would be managed for foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The Gallatin Crest Trail (96) south of Windy Pass should remain open to motorcycles. I suggest options on this trail (96) and the other upper Big Creek Trails in the Porcupine Buffalo Horn travel area comments.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 6 evaluated managing the trails in the WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M would manage several of the historically used routes as open to motorcycles. ATV's would not be permitted on any trails in the study area under this alternative. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Bruce Brock		1208		Keep open for current usage which impinges on no one nor the wildlife. Allow a corridor from the Big Sky Trail to Leven Sky with the big play areas and beautiful view. Include 4-wheelers on Big sky Trail, but on designated trail only.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M would manage several of the historically used routes as open to motorcycles. ATV's would not be permitted on any trails in the study area under this alternative. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the 7M maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision Maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Jim Schipf		854	Bozeman	I would like to see the trails off the Gallatin Crest remain open to mountain bikes A few of us ride these trails, there is not much impact.	Gallatin Crest	In the preferred alternative, several trails leaving the Crest would allow mountain bike travel. Please see the summer non-motorized maps for alternative 7M.
Todd Orr		840		422 - Langhor ridge down to Cottonwood Creek. Could be a great mountain bike trail. Remain closed to motorized use as is all of South Cottonwood drainage.	Gallatin Crest	The route would allow but not emphasis mountain bike use in the preferred alternative 7M.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	Swan Creek trail # 186. Alternative 6 is the best choice for this trail because it prohibits motorcycles and bicycles. Not only are the upper 4-5 miles within the Wilderness Study area, but the last section of the trail leading in the Crest trail #96 has been severely damaged by heedless motorcyclist. It climbs nearly straight up the ridge a deep, muddy rut or piles of soft excavated earth.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative would allow mountain bikes and motorcycles on this route. The travel plan decisions are focused on determining appropriate modes of travel on routes, but does not attempt to address all facility condition issues. We are aware there may be poor trail conditions on some routes were we propose activities other than foot travel. Those maintenance issues will be addressed through other decisions and through standard maintenance.
John Criger		107	Lakewood, CO	Travel restrictions to motorized bikes from Sept 15 to July 15, that is how it is written in the documents, on an annual basis is not acceptable. Then all the GNF has to say is high fire danger come July and the trails are closed year round. Motorcycles are to anymore dangerous to fragile alpine that horses are at least the cycles don't contaminate the area with road apples and weed seed contained within same. Instead of recommending to close trails # 190, 240, and 241 lets look into developing access from the Paradise Valley. Some of these trails could be relocated to stay on FS land if concessions can not be reached with the local property owners. the public lands are not adjoining private property owners special play ground and that is the current status of the public lands in this location. There is no reason for further snowmobile restrictions as they were used in this area in 1977.	Gallatin Crest	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Joe Gutkoski		120	Bozeman	We recommend the FS designate the Gallatin Crest trail, the Emerald Lake, and the Hyalite lake trails and al other trails in the WSA, motor free. In addition to degrading wilderness character, the proposed motorcycle traffic would degrade grizzly habitat in the grizzly recovery area.	Gallatin Crest	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Joyce Conners		135	Bozeman	This is another area that gets a lot of use by hikers. Its nice to have such a trail, following right along the divide. And it too needs to be a quiet trail- no motorized use. Its also another area that tourist go to enjoy the mountains, fall into love with the area, and possibly even bring jobs to the economy went hey move here.	Gallatin Crest	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Klass Gump		140	Big Sky	Gallatin trail, emerald Lake and Hyalite Lake trail, trails in Porcupine-Buffalo Horn area, and all other trails should be motor free. They are degrading the natural character of the area and degrading grizzly Bear Habitat.	Gallatin Crest	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Jan Young		172	Bozeman	Should not be motorized because much of it is in a wilderness study area and motorcycles tear up trails and are quite noisy.	Gallatin Crest	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Fred Opperman		232	Bozeman	I am very much opposed to having motorcycles along the Gallatin Crest trail, Hyalite, & Emerald Lake areas, and Windy Pass. There are so many violation of off trail riding in these areas that are so fragile and have such a short growing season. In the Windy pass section are many remains of petrified trees. There are huge trunks and pieces laying on top of the ground that motorized vehicles could easily carry away. Signs should be posted at trail heads for all users about not picking up these items.	Gallatin Crest	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Chris Naumann		1454		I think that allowing motorcycles access to and passage along the Gallatin Crest is acceptable. Ultimately, I think the entire WSA should be designated non-motorized, but I understand the existence of motorcycle use prior to 1977. I also would like to add that I have never seen trail degradation up on the Crest from motorcycles. Compared to the Bridgers where motorcyclists have seriously impacted the quality of the trail system, I think the few motorcyclists that ride in the Gallatin Crest are much more gentle and are truly up there for the wilderness, backcountry experience.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail would be managed for foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities. See the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.
Patricia Brandon		739	Bozeman	Gallatin Crest Trail needs to remain open the entire length for motorcycles. This will provide several points where cyclists can stop and return by a different route. The Donahue Trail #1Analysis: Issues (General)3 needs to be open for motorcycles. Public funds were used to build this trail and I think some of the funds were OHV funds. Moose Creek trail #1Analysis: Issues (General)7 to Gallatin Crest is a beautiful trail for bikes and not heavily used and is needed to complete a loop trail. Squaw Creek #1Analysis: Issues (General)6 affords opportunity to ride and not return by the same route. This is very important on a ride to not have to go the and return the same route.	Gallatin Crest	Alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on the Crest from Hyalite south to the junction with the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 - Sept. 5. The southern portion of the Crest trail would be managed for foot and stock travel and closed to motorcycles under the preferred alternative to protect grizzly core habitat areas, and to provide non-motorized recreation opportunities. See the summer motorized map for alternative 7M. Our trail easement for the Donahue Trail precludes allowing motorized recreation. The Storm Castle to Hyalite route would also be managed as open to motorcycles and mountain bikes from July 15 - Sept. 5 under the preferred alternative. Please see the summer motorized maps for alternative 7M.
Mark Shyne		775		…leave us access to the trail that runs from Little Bear road all the way to West Yellowstone. That means snowmobile access up Squaw Creek, Moose Creek, Portal Creek, Teepee Creek, etc.	Gallatin River	We believe your comment refers to the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail. In all alternatives except Alternative 6, this route would be managed as open to snowmobiles for it's entire length. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative preserves historic snowmobile access on this route from Little Bear to the Hebgen Basin, with a minor reroute in the Taylor Fork/Sage Creek area. Please see the Alternative 7M winter map for a complete description.
Catherine Weeden		1604		Snowmobilers have told us that the portion of the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail that goes through the WSA is not very safe and not the best place to ride. It would be a coup for the GNF, making both snowmobilers and environmentalists happy, if a path on the west side of the Gallatin River could be found for this trail. This would provide a continuous ride for the snowmobilers and it would protect the winter habitat	Gallatin River Canyon	While the suggestion to relocate the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail outside of the WSA has some appeal, it is outside the scope of the travel plan decision, in that much of the route on the west side of the river is on private property and out of our jurisdiction.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				of the animals which rely on the roadless area east of the river.		
Kerry White		1616		Both Moose and Swan Creeks have the Big Sky trail passing through them but don't provide much area off trail for snowmobiling. Along Swan Creek, Sam Harvey and some others did some maintenance and last winter that trail was real easy on sleds. Squaw Creek and Little Bear are mostly roads and logging spurs. Not much off road areas unless you want to hit stumps. Trail 416 to 79, past Pioneer Lakes and back t our cabin in Squaw Creek on the Swan Creek divide road is also a favorite of my entire family.	Gallatin Roaded	Thank you for your observations. In the preferred alternative, almost all of the area in the Gallatin Roaded Travel Planning Area will be open to or specifically managed for snowmobiling. Please see the winter map.
Thomas B. Wells		553		Squaw Ridge Trail Seg. 1 - Bringing ATVs to the edge of the wilderness with a new trail will guarantee incursion into one of the most remote headwaters south of Bozeman. The same applies to snowmobile use. They don't stop at the divide.	Gallatin Roaded	The Storm Castle Ridge Trail #417 is proposed to be closed to motor vehicles in Alternative 7M adjacent to the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn WSA.
Thomas B. Wells		553		Squaw Ridge Trail Seg 2 - this is wilderness and mountain bikes do not belong. I have seen snowmobiles here in winter. They do not stop at the divide. The only way to stop them is at the trailhead on #417.	Gallatin Roaded	Trail #417 does not enter designated Wilderness anywhere, but does pass into the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn WSA. This trail would be closed to snowmobiles in the preferred alternative. Please see the winter map. Mountain bikes would be allowed on the route under this alternative, but not emphasized. Mountain bikes are not prohibited in Wilderness Study Areas, and are appropriate so long as wilderness character is maintained.
Thomas B. Wells		553		Swan Creek Road #481 - Should be ski only in the winter so that there is ski access to the trail without competition from snowmobilers. This will provide the all ski route from the Gallatin towards the Crest.	Gallatin Roaded	Thank you for your suggestion. Swan Creek Road #481 is proposed to continue to be managed as a groomed snowmobile route, as it is today. This route accesses the historic Big Sky Snowmobile Trail, which is also proposed to continue to be managed primarily for snowmobile travel. Non-motorized ski access to the Crest is proposed to be provided in the Porcupine, South Cottonwood, and Hyalite Drainage nearby, and on many routes on the East side of the Gallatin Range. This configuration allows us to concentrate snowmobile access in the northwest corner of the Gallatin Range and provide a mix of non-motorized opportunities elsewhere. Please see the winter map.
Noreen Breeding		454		Swan Creek Trail #186: Alt 6 is the best choice for this trail because it prohibits motorcycles and bicycles. Not only are the upper 4-5 miles within the WSA, but the last section of the trail leading up to the	Gallatin Roaded	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to manage this route as open to motorcycles from July 15 - September 5. During spring/early summer and fall this trail would be managed

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Crest Trail #96 has been severely damaged by heedless motorcyclists.		for non-motorized recreation opportunities. This configuration allows us to provide high quality single track motorcycling opportunities that were occurring at the time of WSA designation, while protecting wilderness character.
Wendell Morrill		1754	Bozeman	Please reevaluate your decision to close the end of Squaw road which leads to the Hyalite trail for ATV use. This trail will be open to motorcycles. It is a great evening ride to some spectacular views.	Gallatin Roaded	Trail #85 (the upper Storm Castle Trail) is proposed to be managed for motorcycle travel only in Alternative 7M. This route leads into the HPBH WSA and was not historically used by 4 wheeled vehicles at the time of designation, but was used by motorcycles. In order to preserve wilderness character, the preferred alternative would manage this as a single track route.
Loren Blanksma		1194		I did notice some opening dates of July 15th and think an opening date of July 1 or before would be appropriate for this area.	Gallatin Roaded	Thank you for you comment. The routes within this travel planning area all lead into high elevation areas which typically hold snow on north facing slopes until mid July. In order to protect trail facilities and ensure safe traveling we believe it is necessary to keep these routes closed until July 15.
Loren Blanksma		1194		The detailed description for the Gallatin Roaded conflicts with the detailed description for the Gallatin Crest as far as the status of Swan Creek trail (186). Swan Creek trail (186) is a tight difficult trail that should remain open for a technical motorcycle ride. I did not encounter any other users when I rode this trail.	Gallatin Roaded	Thank you for apprising us of this error. This has been corrected in the detailed description of the decision. This route is proposed to be managed as open to motorcycles from 7/15 thru 9/5 in the preferred alternative.
Hank Rate		1038		Retention of all roads that were in place on lands recently acquired for wildlife winter range as "administrative roads" is bad. Every researcher in the country , as well as disabled hunters and their (up to) 3 able-bodied buddies, etc. disrupt wildlife unnecessarily and roads classified as "administrative" are open to a number of such uses upon demand.	General	None of the action alternatives propose to manage all of the routes on recently acquired lands as "administrative" roads. Many of these routes are to be managed as "project roads" which essentially means they are closed to public and routine administrative travel until such time as they are necessary for another project (for example a timber sale or mine) and would be evaluated under a separate NEPA analysis at that time for the specific project. Proposed Standard D-5 says: "Existing roads that were constructed for project use and not designated for motorized use via the Forest Travel Plan are to remain closed to public motorized use." Project routes necessary for future use would be closed to public motorized travel once the project was completed (See proposed Guideline D-7 in the preferred alternative 7M).
Donald Lovely		758		The preferred plan forces allowable activities into more confined areas and compresses them into the shorter time frames, thus, creating the potential for	General	We are aware that concentrating motorized recreation use onto fewer routes will increase the pressure in those areas, potentially causing maintenance issues, etc.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				serious impacts and a reduced quality of experience. Next, a new, further restriction will become a necessity under the guise of the necessary mitigation of these artificially created impacts. It seems to me that a downward spiral is being created.		However, we believe that by focusing our maintenance energy on a reduced number of routes, and improving facilities to handle the potential increase in use that we will be able to mitigate facility issues associated with increased use. We can understand your concern over the potential for additional restrictions in the future, but believe that the configuration of motorized routes that we propose under the preferred alternative at this time will provide adequate opportunities and be manageable for the next several decades.
Linda Miller	Elkhorn Ranch	1433		The spring closure of trails is a problem for the dude ranchers, hunters and the public and, as a user of many of the trails, seems unnecessary. Much of this country monitors itself with snowpack and high water. Some flexibility to allow closure on particularly wet trails wind damage is inevitable might be a better solution.	General	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Season of Use: we generally recommend that road opening and closure dates that currently exist remain the same. This will help ensure adequate hunting access for sportsmen and women.	General	The proposed Travel Plan revision recognized that the current structure of open and closing dates was very complex, and in some cases only changed the closing dates of some routes by several days - increasing the complexity of the current map. A goal for the new plan is to still provide reasonable motorized access for all recreationists in all seasons, but minimize the number of dates that routes were opening and closing to decrease confusion about opening and closing dates in general. Please see Chapter II - in the Detailed Description of the Alternatives volume for an overview of proposed seasonal restrictions and the rationale. Specific dates for specific routes as proposed in Alternative 7M the preferred alternative are listed under each travel planning area.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We appreciate the FS new policy of showing boundaries of and management direction for the HPBH WSA on maps and trailhead information boards, and we strongly encourage the agency to continue and expand this effort, and also to include Recommended Wilderness areas in the effort. Because the FS did not make a concerted effort in the past to inform the public of the WSA and its unique management status, there is now a constituency of users who wrongly assume the FS has an ongoing obligation to allow motorized use of	General	The Forest Service has included the WSA boundary on all of the travel planning maps published, and will include the boundary on future visitor maps published post travel plan decision. This is consistent with recent Regional Policy on the management of WSAs. Recommended Wilderness however is a temporary designation, which may change each time the Forest revises it's Forest Plan. There is no Regional or National Policy that would compel us to include recommended wilderness boundaries on future visitor maps, in fact cartographic guidelines for visitor maps discourages including any

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the area, and this assumption has worked to increase frustration and anger at the proposed limits on motorized use in the travel plan. Alerting the public that the WSA and RWs carry special designations will also alert the public that not all activities are appropriate in these areas.		boundary that is not a legal or permanent feature.
Alex Phillips		1483a		I understand that it takes a change in law to enact "closed unless open". I am fully in support of that change and I would be happy to contact the delegation to tell them. Closed unless open is not only easier to enforce it is also much more economical. Less need for signs and less need to repair old signs.	General	In 2005 the Forest Service passes a new final rule which regulates the management of motor vehicles on Forest roads and trails. Often referred to as the "National OHV Rule" - this decision changed the legal authority through which motorized routes are managed, and moves the entire National Forest System into a "closed unless open" scenario for summer motorized use once each National Forest or Ranger District has completed revising their existing travel plans. This proposed travel plan will be implemented under these new rules and all summer motorized routes will be managed under the "closed unless open" scenario as designated motorized routes.
Joe Polus		1487		Noise Levels: Normal conversation is around the 70dB range. MT regulations require vehicles to be no louder than 78dB. Rangers in the Idaho Sand Dunes use similar monitors to enforce noise regulations for vehicles. This could be a realistic and effective solution for noise issues on the GNF.	General	Montana State Law currently regulates noise requirements for motor vehicle use on roads and trails. However, under current state law, these restrictions are set using outdated technology for measuring violations, making the enforcement of noise violations under current law difficult. Please see Issue 15: Noise in Chapter 3 for a more thorough discussion, and examples of noise statutes which are effective from other states.
Jacquelyn R. Edens		660	Gallatin Gateway	I suggest the Plan be revised to allow ATV's and snowmobiles during hunting season in areas where they can now be used legally. This use for the purposes of setting up and removing camp and/or retrieving game.	General	The proposed preferred alternative 7M would continue to allow snowmobile and ATV travel in many locations (though not all) that are currently open. Under the preferred alternative, use of motorized vehicles off of designated open motorized routes for game retrieval would be prohibited - consistent with the Montana Dakota OHV decision and the recent (2005) National OHV decision. Please see the summer motorized map for Alternative 7M for details of which routes would be managed as open to motorized use, and the detailed description of the alternatives for specific route closure dates.
Paul Griffin	Gallatin Wildlife Association	707		Seasonal road closures that being Oct. 15 - move fall closures up to Sept. 1 to improve quality of archery hunting and reduce the "cruise and shoot" method of harvesting (it can't be called hunting) of blue grouse.	General	Fall closures to provide non-motorized hunting opportunities are proposed to be provided across the Forest in various locations. Many of the proposed open routes in the Gallatin range (especially the higher

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Additionally, such restrictions on harvesting of this bird may help mitigate the large loss of brood rearing habitat on the lower altitude private lands in the Bridger Canyon area.		elevation trails) are proposed to be closed to motor vehicles after September 5 in the preferred alternative. The Forest Service has no jurisdiction over hunting harvests - this is solely under the preview of Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks. Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks provided comments to us relative to motorized access and hunting which were considered when developing the final preferred alternative (7M).
Rich Inman et al	Gallatin Valley Back Country Horsemen	428a		We recommend a strengthened volunteer trail maintenance program be implemented on the Gallatin Forest with participants from the wealth of various volunteer organizations in our area.	General	Good suggestion - thank you. The volunteer component of managing recreation on public lands becomes more important every day and we intend to take full advantage of those opportunities.
Sara Goulden		1757	Bozeman	Separate trail users in the Bozeman area in the summer and fall (by trail/day of the week): have foot travelers and people on horseback share some trails or days of the week; have wheeled travelers (motorcyclists, mountain bikers and ATVs) share other trails or other days of the week. Close trails (short term or long term) to all travel when there is resource damage an/or adverse impact on wildlife.	General	Many comments were received after review of the DEIS and it's preferred alternative which suggested we consider some sort of “time share" on certain routes close to Bozeman. While the preferred alternative in the FEIS does not specifically articulate this scenario - we recognize the merit of the suggestion and have identified a number of routes where "time share" will be considered and implemented in the very near future. At this time we are identifying routes in the south half of the Bridgers and in the northern Gallatin Range where "time share" may be employed, and intend to work with interested parties after the travel plan decision is made to develop the specific architecture of how a "time share" plan could be implemented. The travel plan will simply make decisions about what types of recreation travel are appropriate on which routes - site specific decisions about short term "emergency closures" of routes necessary to mitigate resource damage will be made on a case by case basis under separate decisions from the travel plan. Please see the Record of Decision for more discussion and the final decision on the "time share concept".
Loren Blanksma		1194		Trail Maintenance on the entire GNF could quite easily be accomplished by donated labor from the various user groups. This could be performed under the directives and in cooperation with the FS, thus saving taxpayer funded FS resources and employees for other more important uses. Although, if the current preferred travel plan is implemented, the total number of allowed users will decrease dramatically, possibly making user maintained trails	General	Volunteer work to supplement trail maintenance is an important component of the overall program, but could not completely replace critical work accomplished by trained trail crews or contracts. We do not believe that any of the alternatives being considered will reduce the overall use of our trail system. Our information indicates just the opposite - the use of all types will continue to grow regardless of which alternative is ultimately implemented (see the Chapter 3, Issue 16: Recreation

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				an unfeasible concept.		for a discussion of probable recreation trends).
Steve Jenkins		1875		I feel that those who are most vocal and opinionated should be the ones spending their time helping. The motorized vehicle users should gather one week a year to maintain Emerald lake trail and those in the Bridgers that they so vehemently oppose to closing. The mountain bikers should and have maintained Leverich and Cottonwood Canyons. The Horseman groups could maintain Mystic and other trails that they want to keep open. Lets use all the energy these groups profess to have.	General	Thank you for your suggestion.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Under Goal N, Wilderness, the HPBH WSA and the Lionhead and Republic Mountain Recommended Wilderness areas should be included here, and the relevant legal and policy standards stated clearly and concisely.	Goals and Objectives	Goal N in the DEIS (Goal J in the FEIS) was designed specifically to refer to designated Wilderness and purposefully did not refer to the WSA or recommended wilderness.
Noreen Breeding		454		Goal N. Why are the Hyalite-Porcupine-Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area and the Lionhead and Republic Recommended Wilderness Areas not included with other wilderness protections?	Goals and Objectives	They are not legally designated Wilderness. Goal N and the associated standards were specifically designed to implement Forest Plan direction for designated Wilderness.
Brian Hawthorn	Blue Ribbon Coalition	1196		Goals and Objectives and management emphasis should include: Educating the non-motorized visitors about when and where they may encounter vehicle traffic, as well as informing them of areas where they may avoid such encounters; Educating the vehicle assisted visitor of where the road or trail might be shared with non-motorized visitors, and encouraging slower speeds and a more courteous ethic in these areas; Re-routing either use so as to avoid sections of roads or trails that are extremely popular with both groups; Dispersing all forms of recreational use so as to minimize conflict and create a more desirable experience.	Goals and Objectives	We agree that a very important component of successfully implementing the travel plan is a rigorous information and education campaign about backcountry etiquette. However, your suggestion to state these as actual Goals or Objectives that guide future management of travel on the Gallatin NF doesn't fit exactly with the intent of Goals and Objectives in this context (see pages 1-3 and 1-4 of the FEIS). We fully intend to employ many tools and take advantage of all reasonable opportunities to educate users about ways to protect the quality of the recreation experience they seek.
Donald Lovely		758		Spring break up is cited for limiting trail access via horseback until June 15 this closure essentially eliminates backcountry access for Montana's spring bear season which is usually April 15 through June 15. Very few hunters have the physical ability to take a 300 pound animal impacted out five or 10 miles on their back. This is particularly true for Cabin Creek and Taylor Fork units. If this closure is	Grizzly Bears	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				enforced, and one can assume that only those bears that are easily assessable from roads open to vehicles will be taken. Not only will this restriction concentrate activities into a lesser area, but over time it will impact the harvest age as few are mature animals will be accessible to hunters.... and shortly harvest restrictions will have to be imposed.		
Mike Slevin		977	West Yellowstone	If a road isn't posted open then it should be considered closed is just wrong. There are many roads/ trails that we as locals use to gather firewood as well as for hunting and getting to forest lands to our favorite fishing holes.	Hebgen Basin	We understand your concern about switching to a "closed unless open" management scenario. The Montana Dakota OHV decision in 2001 and the recent National OHV direction that was finalized in 2005 mandates that all summer wheeled motor vehicle travel on Forest roads and trails occur on designated routes. Any route that is not designated as open will be closed to motorized travel upon completion of travel plan revision under current Regional and National direction. This change in travel management regulations comes after many years of public involvement and feedback from natural resource managers as well as the public that managing summer motorized travel on a system of designated routes will do much to curb issues associated with "unmanaged recreation" use of public land.
Thomas H. Gibson		1289		The intensive management of the west fork of the Madison is a prime example. For 20 years or more, we road and hiked and enjoyed the area without seeing visible impacts. Now with only select trails available for motorized recreation, the impact of uses are clearly visible because everyone must use exactly the same trail and tracks of or face enforcement action.	Hebgen Basin	The West Fork of the Madison is on the Beaverhead - Deerlodge National Forest and is outside the scope of the decisions being considered under the Gallatin National Forest Travel Plan Revision. The Madison District has however managed motorized travel on designated routes only for over 20 years, so the "visible impacts" you note are likely due to an increase in the volume of use, not the outcome of changing management of motorized use.
Sara Goulden		1757		Restrict and/or disallow the use of commercial or private helicopter use in all the ranges in the Gallatin National Forest in winter and the other seasons. In April 2004 I sent a letter to the GNF expressing my dismay and concern about a helicopter that was shuttling skiers from Battle Ridge to the northern part of the Range and to the Southern part of the Bridgers. The helicopter noise was offensive, but more important were the issues of safety and public land use. A helicopter landing on avalanche terrain above other public land users can trigger a slide with	Helicopters	The Federal Aviation Association currently prohibits the landing of recreational aircraft - including helicopters - on National Forests except at designated landing strips. Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative identifies an additional Standard (A-7) which states: Public recreational aircraft landings/takeoffs shall not be allowed except at designated and authorized sites. Implementation of this standard would be through special order prohibition of landings under 36 CFR 261.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				potential life threatening consequences. Public campgrounds or other public land facilities should not be used as landing strips for helicopters or pick-up spots for skiers. The impact by helicopters on wildlife, human safety, noise pollution and public land needs to be evaluated through an EIS process and public comments.		
David Schliz		1125		The Beartooth Backcountry Horsemen oppose the proposed yearlong closure of the Lava Lake Trail and the Pine Creek Trail to stock use. We also believe the alternatives analysis has not thoroughly analyzed or disclosed the effects of stock use to the resource on these proposed trail closures. The DEIS also does not demonstrate that this proposed action will meet the intent and objectives stated.	Horses	Alternative 7M modifies the proposal in the DEIS to prohibit stock altogether on these routes, to a seasonal prohibition from December 2 - September 15, and a prohibition on overnight stock use in the lake basins. We believe this compromise addresses the safety concerns of mixed traffic during the most congested heavy use season by hikers during the summer, and still allows stock access after heavy traffic tapers off in the fall.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	The DEIS on pg 3-405 on Horse Off-Trail Use states, "In all alternatives, horses are allowed off-trail except in specifically closed areas of the Absoroka Beartooth Plateau." While still discussing Horse Off-Trail Use the DEIS on pg 3-405 goes on to state, "The prohibition of wheeled motorized vehicle travel off designated routes greatly reduces the potential for soil quality and high alpine vegetation impacts. Therefore, alternatives 2-6 are all acceptable from a soil quality perspective." In other words the DEIS says Horse Off-Trail Use is acceptable because Motorized Off-Trail Use is prohibited by the OHV decision of 2001. The double standard reeks of discrimination.	Horses	The Montana Dakota OHV Decision of 2001 does not allow cross country motor vehicle travel, nor does the recent direction stated in the 2005 National OHV rule. Both of these decisions recognized that there are significant resource benefits to managing summer motorized use on designated routes. There is currently no Agency policy that requires that horses travel only on designated routes, nor have there been any resource or social issues raised which would compel us to consider this proposal at this time with the exception of site specific issues such as the proliferation of user created routes on the Beartooth Plateau where stock restrictions are being considered.
Yancey Arterburn	Lone Mt. Ranch	1052	Big Sky	Alternative 7 limits access from April 1st - June 15th or from April 1st - June 1st on designated routes for Wheeled vehicles, mountain bikes and stock. We are very concerned about the date restrictions for stock especially in the mid and low elevations. The proposed date restrictions would pose operational problems for businesses such as ours. Our guest season starts at the beginning of June and it is imperative that we hire and train staff prior to that time. Quality service and safety are major reasons we go to the time and expense of exposing our guides to the various trails they will guide on during the season.	Horses	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Danielle Nicholas		1105		I am opposed to any restrictions of horses or other pack livestock on the GNF. Pack stock made the trails that we all enjoy and should be allowed to continue to use them in all regions. Significant portions of the economy for the population using the GNF derives from tourism dollars gained from outfitting. It would be a disservice to the heart and soul of this community to further regulate pack stock users.	Horses	The preferred Alternative 7M proposes very few changes to restrictions relative to packstock. Two heavily used trails (Pine Creek and Lava Lake) are proposed to be closed seasonally to stock from Dec. 2 - September 15 to minimize user conflicts and safety concerns with hikers on these very heavily traveled routes. These trails would re-open after the primary summer hiking season. In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. Lastly - a seasonal restriction to stock use is proposed on the trail-less portions of the Beartooth Plateau to protect this fragile area during it's wettest times. Day use of stock would be permissible from August 1 - Dec. 1 in the preferred alternative within this area.
David Schliz		1125		The Beartooth Backcountry Horsemen do not support in most cases proposed seasonal trail closures relating to stock use. We believe that the alternatives analysis in the DEIS has not thoroughly analyzed or disclosed the effects of stock use to the resource on these proposed trail closures.	Horses	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Bob Schaap	Lone Mountain Ranch	1528	Big Sky	Closure dates for stock use - Because the guests begin arriving at the beginning of June we must complete training and be ready to accept guests by June 1. The proposed date restrictions would pose operational problems for businesses such as ours. Stating the obvious, the arbitrary closure dates included in Alt 7 will be an overkill in low snow years and, in other years with late snow, may even be too early. Each year is different and arbitrary closure dates do not recognize the unpredictability of each season.	Horses	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Nick Shrauger		1544	Bozeman	My comments concern horse drawn wagons. In my brief examination of the plan I do not find any reference to this type of recreation. Those of us with teams and wagons are always looking for places to do pleasure driving and camping. I believe this type of recreation should be considered as part of the study and inventory. I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss this with Jim or Steve.	Horses	The recreational use of horse drawn wagons was not an activity that larger public requested we consider managing for. Horse drawn wagons would be permissible on any open forest road, and on project or administrative roads that were not also used as trails. Wagons larger than 50" wide would not be allowed on forest trails. Cross country travel of wagons would not be prohibited, however, if this sort of use resulted in

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						resource damage (rutting, destroying vegetation, etc.) it would be illegal.
Dale P. Ragain		1037	Ennis	I find it difficult to comment because it seems hard to find reasons why many of the closures are proposed at all. Just what period some trails would be closed in the preferred alternative is unclear to me. It appears that the plan in some cases was to have some kind of variable season closure based on when the appropriate official decided to open the trails.	Horses	Descriptions of proposed spring restrictions for stock were display in the Detailed Description of alternatives. In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Dale P. Ragain		1037		The snow free season in many of the areas of proposed seasonal closures to livestock is short. The proposed closures would take away a significant part of that season.	Horses	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Jake Grimm		1304	Gallatin Gateway	Closing the forest to horse travel from April 1 through June 15 has a major effect on our trail ride operation. June 15 is based on the weather patterns of the 70s which we all know have changed with the climate warming.	Horses	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Will Robertson		304		I am primarily a mountain biker, and I like the spring restrictions on trails. Not because I think bikes cause the most trail damage, but because the restrictions also include horses. Finally! This is a good compromise.	Horses	Alternative 7M no longer proposes to impose "blanket" spring seasonal restrictions for either mountain bikes or stock. About a dozen specific routes would have spring restrictions for bikes and stock to address trail facility issues on these routes.
Anson H. Crutcher		326	Bozeman	This letter is to state my objections to the seasonal restrictions on horse travel contained in the Gallatin National Forest Travel Management Plan. There is no basis for such a ban. Horse and their rider have been traveling these mountains and river valleys year-round for the long before Lewis and Clark. This ban is unprecedented on any national forest land. Most of the trails in question have been there for years and years without any problems that would justify such a ban.	Horses	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Bryce Kawasaki	Montana Professional Horseshoer's	1361	Gallatin Gateway	I oppose the seasonal closures to horses on the Gallatin National Forest. Our association represents many furriers operating small businesses in and	Horses	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Association			around the Gallatin National Forest. We feel that closure to horse use will adversely affect our ability to do business.		number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Jerry and Jodee Kawasaki		1362	Gallatin Gateway	Since horses and mules built, maintained, and used all of the trails and roads for more than a century, I would say historical use applies under the Wilderness Act. Any limitation or restriction proposed in the Draft EIS does not follow the intent of the law.	Horses	The Wilderness Act does not prescribe any specific activities be maintained, but does mandate that the Agency administer the areas " in such a manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character". The act goes on to describe wilderness as areas that "...generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable...". This mandate may lead to prohibition of certain uses including stock use to protect the wild character of wilderness if such use perpetuates unacceptable resource impacts.
Jerry and Jodee Kawasaki		1362		The rationale and analysis within the DEIS does not clearly justify or display the need to limit or deny access to horses or mules to use the entire trail system during any time of the year within the Gallatin National Forest.	Horses	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Robb Larson		1391		The Plan should recognize that the use of horses on trail systems has a more severe impact on trails than does the use of bicycles-or any other nonmotorized activity. Excessive horse use, especially by large numbers of horses in commercial activities or pack strings, results in an inordinate amount of trail damage and precludes the enjoyment of trails by all other users. The large amount of space required by horse users at the trailhead leads to parking issues, increased trailhead area maintenance costs, etc. The notion that horse use is a "traditional" activity should not be given excess weighting when defining acceptable use or limits to use.	Horses	We appreciate your concern relative to the effect that stock use may have in certain areas, and acknowledge that stock use can have a negative effect on trail condition. Effects from stock were considered in the design of the proposed preferred alternative, and in some cases and in certain alternatives, stock restrictions proposed to mitigate those effects. Several commenters indicated concern with effects from the commercial use of stock, from damaged trails to multiple trailing in some areas. We considered this, and concluded that it was not appropriate to address this stock issue through the travel plan, but rather through the administration of special use permits for stock supported activities.
Ron Orton		1472b		Horses are hard on trails in numbers especially. Guides who currently profit from use of the forest need to provide trail maintenance on specific trails that they use. In some cases these trails can be unusable unless you are on horseback (Buffalo Horn	Horses	We appreciate your concern relative to the effect that stock use may have in certain areas, and acknowledge that stock use can have a negative effect on trail condition. Effects from stock were considered in the design of the proposed preferred alternative, and in

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				for example).		some cases and in certain alternatives, stock restrictions proposed to mitigate those effects. Several commenters indicated concern with effects from the commercial use of stock, from damaged trails to multiple trailing in some areas. We considered this, and concluded that it was not appropriate to address this stock issue through the travel plan, but rather through the administration of special use permits for stock supported activities.
Todd Orr		1473		Trail damage by horses is the most wide spread and severe. Both the intensity of use and the rider's inability to follow single file has resulted in severe trail damage in some areas. I have witnessed and photographed horse trails in excess of 20 feet wide and 2 feet deep, with no vegetative cover. Soil displacement and compaction is severe on many of these trails. This damage is most prevalent on trails near dude ranches offering trail rides. Trail damage across the Gallatin from horse use is far more severe and extensive than motorized damage and would take considerably more effort and time to repair to a desired condition.	Horses	We appreciate your concern relative to the effect that stock use may have in certain areas, and acknowledge that stock use can have a negative effect on trail condition. Effects from stock were considered in the design of the proposed preferred alternative, and in some cases and in certain alternatives, stock restrictions proposed to mitigate those effects. Several commenters indicated concern with effects from the commercial use of stock, from damaged trails to multiple trailing in some areas. We considered this, and concluded that it was not appropriate to address this stock issue through the travel plan, but rather through the administration of special use permits for stock supported activities.
Todd Orr		1473		Most horse user-made trails were new route construction along ridges and through natural openings to access better scenic views or change of scenery, to gain a hunting advantage, or to vary the distance of loop-rides for dude ranch scenic day trips. Many additional horse user made trails are continually being cut out and constructed each year.	Horses	We appreciate your concern relative to the effect that stock use may have in certain areas, and acknowledge that stock use can have a negative effect on trail condition. Effects from stock were considered in the design of the proposed preferred alternative, and in some cases and in certain alternatives, stock restrictions proposed to mitigate those effects. Several commenters indicated concern with effects from the commercial use of stock, from damaged trails to multiple trailing in some areas. We considered this, and concluded that it was not appropriate to address this stock issue through the travel plan, but rather through the administration of special use permits for stock supported activities.
Joe Polus		1487		There is more horse use than motorcycle use on the GNF. Horse use is increasing faster than motorcycle use. Horses have a much larger negative impact on the facilities of the GNF than motorcycles. The DEIS fails to acknowledge and fairly compare the above mentioned issues.	Horses	Our research also supports that horse use may have a greater impact on trails than do other uses (see the Chapter 3: Issue 19 Soils, and Issue 21 Wilderness) for a comparison of the effects of stock use versus other uses.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Rich Inman et al	Gallatin Valley Back Country Horsemen	428a	Bozeman	we are opposed to any blanket type 9area or seasonal) closure to stock use. However, we would support other restrictions or actions to the extent that they are clearly necessary for resource protection or safety. We expect this would be done through site specific NEPA analysis with opportunity for public involvement.	Horses	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Rich Inman et al	Gallatin Valley Back Country Horsemen	428a		The Gallatin Valley Backcountry Horsemen are opposed to seasonal closures. The outcome for us seems the same as a blanket closure. We recommend instead, site specific closures where and when trail conditions warrant. In talking with your professionals, we came away unconvinced that the spring freeze/thaw cycle is significantly different from impacts such as intense thunderstorms, wet fall hunting season, or other similar conditions. We know most of these impacts can be mitigated through proper maintenance and/or relocation of certain trail sections. We spend considerable time maintaining trails prior to June and July 15th. Your seasonal closures would preclude us from providing this volunteer service.	Horses	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Rich Inman et al	Gallatin Valley Back Country Horsemen	428a		Upon further study we find, in fact, that seasonal closures are proposed for all trails on the forest. This, in effect, becomes a blanket closure until either May 15, June 1, June 15 or July 15. You do not have the resources for implementation, nor will you receive the priority to check conditions to see if trails can be open earlier than the assigned closure dates.	Horses	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Mark Kossler		218	Gallatin Gateway	I am opposed to the closure of wilderness area of the GNF to stock travel. This is a historical use that allows many people to use the back country for recreation.	Horses	Thank you for your comment. We do not propose to "close the wilderness" to stock in any alternative. The preferred alternative does propose to seasonally prohibit stock use in certain areas to mitigate user conflicts, address safety concerns, and mitigate damage from stock on the fragile high elevation trail-less portion of the Beartooth Plateau. Please see the Alternative 7M summer non-motorized map.
Donald Lovely		758	Helena	Spring breakup is cited for limiting trail access via horseback until June 15. I'm particularly interested in the restriction as it applies to Cabin Creek and the Taylor Fork units. This closure essentially eliminates backcountry access for Montana's spring bear season which is usually April 15 - June 15. Very few	Horses	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				hunters have the physical ability to take a 300 pound animal and pack it out 5 or 10 miles on their back. If this closure is enforced, then one can assume that only those bears easily accessible from roads or open to vehicles will be taken. Not only will this restriction concentrate activities into a lesser area, but over time it will impact the harvest age as fewer mature animals will be accessible to hunters...and shortly harvest restrictions will have to be imposed.		routes.
Tutti Skaar		777	Bozeman	As a horseback rider, I would also like to see a balance of horse trails that have good access to water, that aren't shared with motorcycles and four wheelers. Horses and motorized vehicles don't mix too well.	Horses	Nearly all the Gallatin NF trails would be open to horses. In alternative 7M - many miles of trail are emphasized for stock with good access to water. In the preferred alternative the we would manage over 2100 miles of trail , and nearly 1700 miles would be emphasized for horses (stock) with motorized use restricted or prohibited.
Mary Bateson		1182	Bozeman	The Hyalite-Porcupine-Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area should be kept motor free to protect wildlife habitat and maintain wilderness character.	HPBH WSA	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the decision maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Allowing mountain bikes, a nonexisting 1977 use but disallowing motorcycles when they where allowed but may not used circa1977, is discrimination.	HPBH WSA	In all action alternatives except alternative 6, motorcycles would be allowed on various trails in the wilderness study area. Alternative 6 would prohibit both mountain bikes and motorcycles within the WSA. Region 1 policy outlined in Forest Service Manual Supplement 2320-2006-1 articulates that mountain bikes are an appropriate use on routes with established motorcycle use in 1977 an on non-motorized routes so long as the total number of motorized or mechanized trails maintains wilderness character circa 1977. Congress recognized that existing uses were expected to grow and conditions would not remain static into the future. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. Providing a range of recreation opportunities within the wilderness study area that maintain wilderness character and meet recreation objectives is not discriminatory.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	Several important motorcycle trails in the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area are slated for closure even though they where used by motorcycles before 1977. The DEIS discussing pre-1977uses on pg 3-346 states, "…the South Rock, Blackmore, Middle Fork of Hyalite, and East Fork of	HPBH WSA	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System". Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses that were occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Hyalite Creeks trails had legal public access. Further, they were essentially only used for motorcycles, because they are to steep and narrow for larger vehicles. " The Forest Service DEIS acknowledges motorcycle use pre-1977 and yet proposes closure which is segregation and discriminatory and violates the law S393 which supercedes all Forest Plan Direction.		use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. Use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. Through this planning process, the preferred alternative identified several routes that were previously managed for motorized use as important areas to provide non-motorized trail opportunities, and to improve grizzly bear core habitat where motorized use would be prohibited. Providing a range of recreation opportunities within the wilderness study area that maintain wilderness character and meet recreation objectives is not discriminatory.
Donald Mazzola		69		Protect the HPBH WSA from snowmobiles. This area is rich in wildlife and deserves to be managed as wilderness.	HPBH WSA	Alternative 6 would prohibit snowmobiling within the HPBH WSA. Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative would manage a significant portion of the WSA as closed to snowmobiles not allowing a proliferation of snowmobile use across the entire WSA. See the winter map for Alternative 7M. This alternative is consistent with Forest Plan language that states a variety of motorized and non motorized recreation opportunities are appropriate within the HPBH, and with our obligation to ensure wilderness character circa 1977 is maintained or improved per the Montana Wilderness Study Act. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for a discussion and display of the final configuration of snowmobile opportunities.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617	Bozeman	In making decisions about trail maintenance, improvement, construction, motorized use and closings, the FS must consider the impact of its decisions on the wilderness character of the HPBH as it existed in 1977. To conclude that motorized use at some level must be maintained is incorrect if the FS finds that continuing such use will degrade wilderness character.	HPBH WSA	We concur with this comment. All alternatives consider the effect of motorized use on wilderness character circa 1977. This analysis did not conclude that allowing some motorized use (with specific vehicle types) would degrade wilderness character circa 1977. See the effects discussion for the WSA in chapter 3. The preferred alternative would allow motorcycle use and snowmobile use in specific areas, and found that

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						proposal to be consistent with the mandates of the Wilderness Study Act and current Forest Plan direction for the area.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Moreover, the FS has repeatedly recognized that monitoring and enforcement of motorized recreation is deficient for nearly all national forests. Wilderness character is degraded by motorized use and the extent to which it is degraded can only be determined through regular monitoring and rigorous enforcement. Amount and type of mechanized use is somewhat irrelevant if the wilderness character is being degraded by such use.	HPBH WSA	We agree that monitoring of all uses or activities in a WSA that could degrade wilderness character is important and critical for adjusting management strategies for protection of wilderness character. Monitoring has shown us that certain areas of the HPHB were being degraded from 1977 condition by ATV's - those areas have been placed under emergency closure to ATV's since 1997, and alternative 7M would prohibit ATV's with the study area. Please see the Decision maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configurations of summer and winter recreation opportunities.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	The Hyalite-Porcupine-Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area should be closed to all motorized use. Because there is no way to manage the numbers and changed technology of motorized vehicles in the WSA, the Gallatin NF cannot maintain 1977 levels. The best way to meet the intent of the Wilderness Study Act is to keep the area closed to motorized use.	HPBH WSA	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Kim Davitt	American Wildlands	1050	Bozeman	We disagree with the opening up of new terrain in the Ramshorn-Tom Miner corridor. This decision is inconsistent with the FS's own apparent logic and rationale as this area is clearly outside the 1977 use area as documented in the Forest Service's 2003 HPBH-WSA (Wilderness) Character Assessment.	HPBH WSA	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative would prohibit snowmobiles in the Tom-Minor corridor.
Ryan Beasley		1054		Wilderness study areas need to be maintained at uses prior to 1977 in this area. Snowmobiling in the Rock Creek and Hyalite areas have been going on since 1968.	HPBH WSA	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Stacey Hancock		1311	Colorado	Hyalite-Porcupine-Buffalo Horn wilderness study area: Being as it is a wilderness study area, it must be protected as wilderness. Thus, motorized use should not be allowed in this area.	HPBH WSA	Congress in designating wilderness study areas under S. 393 did not mandate that these areas be managed "as wilderness", but rather to maintain existing wilderness character and future designation potential. Early versions of S. 393 that did propose to manage WSAs as though they were Wilderness were rejected by Congress for the current version. Alternative 6 would prohibit all motorized and mechanized recreation use in the HPBH WSA. The preferred alternative would allow some motorized and mechanized use consistent with maintaining wilderness character circa 1977. Please see the Decision maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of motorized and non-motorized uses in the HPBH.
Diane Tipton		481	Helena	I am also in support of increased non-motorized trails, including limiting OHVs and motorcycles in the Wilderness Study area and designating Gallatin Crest, Emerald and Hyalite Lake trails as non-motorized. Similarly, I support the designation of non-motorized trails in the Bridger Range. The entire wilderness area that is recommended should be managed as non-motorized and snowmobile free. As a native Montanan, it doesn't compute in my mind to have wilderness and then allow intrusive forms of travel. In line with that, any open non-motorized trails should be carefully planned and managed to minimize impact for wildlife and the long-term well-being of the area designated as wilderness.	HPBH WSA	Alternative 6 studies the options you suggest, please see the FEIS. Alternative 7M would provide a variety of motorized and non-motorized opportunities in the Bridgers and the HPBH WSA (please see the 7M summer and winter motorized maps). Additionally, the concept of "time shared" uses is being considered in the Bridgers and the Gallatin Range, where certain routes that are proposed to be open to motorcycles would also have days of the week or some similar time schedule when they would be closed to motorized uses. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative does propose to manage the Republic and Lionhead recommended wilderness areas for non-motorized uses. Please see the Decision maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of uses in all these areas.
Roger A. Jenkins		487	Bozeman	It has come to my attention that the Gallatin NF policy is, and will continue to be permitting the use of motorbikes and snowmobiles in the above mentioned WSA. The rationale for this is the	HPBH WSA	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				"grandfathering" of these vehicles and/or their access because their use pre-dates that of congressional designation of the WSA. One day, this will be a Wilderness area and it is important to get motorized users used to the idea of no access to this area.		Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Steve Moore		505	Bozeman	Further, trail damage in the HPBH WSA is starting to become more evident as in this photo: In addition to ruining the recreational opportunities of the majority of forest users, it negatively impacts critical wildlife habitat and, when taken to extremes as in other parts of the forest, can seriously impact water quality and fisheries as well. ...Most importantly, trail 96 that runs the length of the crest, must not become a motorized highway.	HPBH WSA	The Forest recognized in the mid 1990's that certain activities within the HPBH WSA were having a negative effect on wilderness character circa 1977. Specifically activities (like ATV use) that were converting single track trails to double track trails had a tangible effect. This travel plan considered those effects and issues tied to recreational use of all sorts within the study area. Alternative 7M proposes to allow only motorcycles on certain trails within the HPBH from July 15 - Sept. 5 to ensure that wilderness character is preserved and that

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						motorized use does not expand to all areas within the study area. Alternative 6 evaluated the effect of managing the entire WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301		ATV use in the HPBH is not documented historically and we support the Forest Service's decision to end ATV use in the HPBH WSA.	HPBH WSA	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative would not allow ATV's within the wilderness study area.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301		Although snowmobiles and motorcycles were used in the WSA in 1977, how much motorcycle and snowmobile use and where such use existed was not documented.	HPBH WSA	Your statement is correct. We have very limited information regarding the amount of use which was occurring within the HPBH in 1977. We do not believe the lack of this information provides barriers to accurate effects analysis of the alternatives. Please see the discussion on pages 3-571 through 3-572 about this topic in the FEIS.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We disagree with the opening of new terrain in the Ramshorn-Tom Miner corridor. This decision is inconsistent with the Forest Services own apparent logic and rationale, as this area is clearly outside the 1977 use area as documented in the 2003 HPBH WSA (Wilderness) Character Assessment. We agree with the reasonable policy (FSM 2329.3c) of allowing mountain bikes to use trails that are open to motorcycles even though there were no bikes in use in 1977. We disagree strongly, however, what the proposal for the extensive network of designated motorcycle trails in the WSA.	HPBH WSA	The preferred Alternative 7M would manage the Tom Minor-Ramshorn corridor as closed to snowmobiles in the winter. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4).

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Extensive motorized to use negatively impacts the supplemental values of the WSA. In particular, we would highlight the impact of motorized winter travel on bear and elk habitat, the impact of summer travel on the world -- class resource of the Gallatin Petrified Forest, and the serious problem of the spread of invasive weeds by wheeled vehicles and the effect on wildlife habitat. We asked the Forest Service to address all the new WSA issues specifically and in geographic detail in the FEIS.	HPBH WSA	The FEIS provides a comprehensive review of effects of all alternatives. Please see the information provided throughout chapter 3.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		It also appears that this draft plan is in strong contrast to the Lewis and Clark National Forest's plan for the Big Snowies WSA, which limits motorized use much more than the Gallatin is proposing for the HPBH, and maintains a large, motor free core area, in contrast to the Gallatin's HPBH proposal. We request that the Gallatin compared the two plans for consistency with the MWSA, and provide an answer to the obvious question of how such different plans can both meet	HPBH WSA	Congress provided clarifying intent which is housed in the Congressional Record on how different forest travel management efforts could come to seemingly different outcomes when revising travel plans within wilderness study areas. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the terms of the law.		could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Lewis and Clark provides logic for their preferred alternative which is in keeping with S. 393, as does the Gallatin Forest Travel Plan preferred alternative. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH, and an extensive discussion on rationale for the final decision.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We have two specific comments regarding WSA legal issues: the MWSA established a ceiling, not a floor, for motorized use inside the to the WSA. The plain language of the MWSA addresses wilderness character, not opportunities for motorized use. We have heard from at least one Forest Service employee that motorcycle and snowmobile use as in 1977 is legally grandfathered. This is clearly not the case. The Forest Service can close the entire WSA to motorized use and be in full compliance with the law. Increases in motorized use and increases in the speed, power, and a range of motorcycles and snowmobiles since 1977 are a negative impact on the wilderness character of the HPBH WSA. Allowing motorized uses in the WSA simply on the basis of where specific machines were used in 1977, the Forest Service's apparent that never clearly stated rationale for the draft proposal, does not address this fundamental fact.	HPBH WSA	We agree that S. 393 established the baseline of direction for careful management of wilderness study areas. The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		To meet the terms of the MWSA, the Forest Service must weigh the effects have increased use and increases in machine capability and constructing the final plan, and explain specifically in the final EIS how they have been accounted for. We urge the Forest Service to provide a specific answer to this question in the final EIS: How, specifically, is this allocation of motorized and motor-free trails and areas, given increases motorized use and machine capabilities since 1977 and a likely increases in the same variables over the life of the plan, consistent with the MWSA and Forest Service policy?	HPBH WSA	We also believe we must carefully weigh what effect changes in technology and use patterns have on wilderness character circa 1977. We have very limited information regarding the amount of use which was occurring within the HPBH in 1977. We do not believe the lack of this information provides barriers to accurate effects analysis of the alternatives. Please see the discussion on pages 3-571 through 3-572 about this topic in the FEIS. The preferred alternative provides a configuration of designated routes for motorized/mechanized uses and snowmobiling that is more restrictive than opportunities that were available in 1977. By mandating vehicle types, designating routes and seasons of use we believe we can manage modern motorcycle and snowmobile opportunities while providing significant blocks of the WSA that are reserved for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. Alternative 7M would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-	1440		Absent reliable 1977 use data and a plan based on that data, managing the WSA as motor free is the only feasible way for the forest service to adhere to the MWSA a mandate to maintain 1977 wilderness	HPBH WSA	We also believe we must carefully weigh what effect changes in technology and use patterns have on wilderness character circa 1977. We have very limited information regarding the amount of use which was

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Gallatin Chapter			character. The only reasonable exception to this policy may be the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail, and we strongly support relocating the trail outside, or primarily outside, the WSA to protect the wilderness character of the rest of the area, as there are few physical barriers to prevent snowmobile travel off the trail.		occurring within the HPBH in 1977. We do not believe the lack of this information provides barriers to accurate effects analysis of the alternatives. Please see the discussion on pages 3-571 through 3-572 about this topic in the FEIS.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We strongly support a monitoring program for the WSA; lack of monitoring in the past is the main reason the Forest Service is facing contentious issues in the WSA today.	HPBH WSA	We concur that monitoring is an important component of managing a wilderness study area. Various monitoring protocols have been employed in the WSA in the past, and will be refined outside of the travel planning process in the future. The Travel Plan does address monitoring as it relates to travel planning specifically - please see Appendix B of Volume One of the FEIS.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We also strongly support a specific area plan for the WSA, preferably based on Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) methodology as suggested in the DEIS. Even if the HPBH were not a WSA, an area plan would be a good idea due to the significance of the area for wildlife and recreation.	HPBH WSA	Creating a "management plan for the WSA" is outside of the scope of this decision. Management direction for lands within the HPBH WSA are articulated in our current Forest Plan. The Forest is planning to develop a more rigorous monitoring protocol for the WSA in the future - to be in keeping with direction in the Forest Plan, and the direction found in Forest Service Manual Interim Directive id_2300-2005-1.
Larry Copenhaver	Montana Wildlife Federation	1441		Goal 2, alternative 6 does not permit mechanized use within the WSA and is an appropriate choice.	HPBH WSA	Alternative 6 was fully explored in the FEIS. The preferred alternative 7M does propose a variety of mechanized uses in the WSA - please see the Detailed Description of Alternatives and the Record of Decision for a complete description.
Joe Polus		1487		Becki brought up the WSA and the importance of meeting the 1977 standard. She stated pictures (proof) of pre-1977 use in the WSA would help immensely in how to manage this area. A series of pictures were provided that proves snowmobile use in the Crest area.	HPBH WSA	Thank you. Historic information on wilderness character in the WSA circa 1977 was important in helping us establish sideboards for future management.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	The interim directive No. 2300-2005-1 from the region 1 forester, states that, in the WSA, "Mountain bikes may be allowed on trails that had established motor-bike use in 1977." Motorized use between Blackmore Peak and South Cottonwood Canyon was prohibited in 1977. Therefore, mountain bikes are not legal inside this part of the WSA.	HPBH WSA	The Regional Forester reconsidered this language in a 2006 reissuance of this interim directive. The modified language now reads: Mountain Bikes may be allowed on trails that had established motor-bike use in 1977, or on non-motorized trails as long as the total amount of mountain bike and motorcycle use maintains with wilderness character as it existed in 1977 (see FSM id-2320-id-2320-2006-1). This change was designed to acknowledge that Congress recognized that use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. All mountain bike routes proposed in the preferred alternative meet this intent. Please see the summer non-motorized maps for the configuration of bike routes proposed. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of uses in the wilderness study area.
Joe Gutkoski		120	Bozeman	We recommended the Forest Service restrict all motorized use in the WSA because the USFS is required by law of 1977 to protect the Wilderness character of the Wilderness study area.	HPBH WSA	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Rich Piercy		126	Big Sky	I would like to see additional restriction basically eliminating all motorized travel in the Wilderness Study Area. I personally feel that motorcycles should be treated the same as ATVs, they are noisy, the single track can tear little plants and can cause erosion worse that an ATV and destroy the wilderness experience and disturbed wildlife the same as an ATV.	HPBH WSA	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Kevin Cox		133	Bozeman	The Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn its is particular interest to me. WSA should be managed as wilderness. The resource damage I have seen while hiking the Gallatin Crest Trail is enough of an indication to close the area to motorcycle use. The trail is 'v" in (tread) in many places and is impossible to hike on. Noxious weeds are also present. More user conflict will arise with continues motorcycle use and the resource will continue to be damaged.	HPBH WSA	Congress in designating wilderness study areas under S. 393 did not mandate that these areas be managed "as wilderness", but rather to maintain existing wilderness character and future designation potential. Early versions of S. 393 that did propose to manage WSAs as though they were Wilderness were rejected by Congress for the current version. Alternative 6 would prohibit all motorized and mechanized recreation use in the HPBH WSA. The preferred alternative would allow some motorized and mechanized use consistent with maintaining wilderness character circa 1977. Please see the Decision maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of motorized and non-motorized uses in the HPBH.
Jeanne Cunnimgs		184		As a frequent hiker and horseback rider in the Porcupine Buffalo Horn area, I feel strongly that motorized vehicles should not be permitted. There are still rutted trails from former use and there are many options for these ATVs. The noise is very disagreeable when one is enjoying the sight and sounds of this glorious area. Wildlife disturbance is also a issue.	HPBH WSA	The Forest recognized in the mid 1990's that certain activities within the HPBH WSA were having a negative effect on wilderness character circa 1977. Specifically activities (like ATV use) that were converting single track trails to double track trails had a tangible effect. This travel plan considered those effects and issues tied to recreational use of all sorts within the study area. Alternative 7M proposes to allow only motorcycles on certain trails within the HPBH from July 15 - Sept. 5 to ensure that wilderness character is preserved and that motorized use does not expand to all areas within the study area. Alternative 6 evaluated the effect of managing the entire WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Fred Opperman		232	Bozeman	My concern that allowing motorcycles especially in the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn Wilderness study area will add to the spread of noxious weeds. Already one can see the noxious weeds along the trails, yet if you get off the trail 50-100 yards the percentage of weeds go down drastically. Plus the sound of motorcycles and snowmobiles is not the place for them in the wilderness study are. Thank you for proposing to ban ATVs in this area.	HPBH WSA	There is not sufficient evidence that motorcycle use would contribute any more to the spread of noxious weeds than do the use of recreational livestock or hikers and their pets. Human use of all types certainly does provide a vector for transporting weed seeds, no alternatives propose to eliminate human use from the wilderness study area simply to ensure weed spread is minimized.
Linn Barrett		258	Greely, CO	I support the Forest Service's draft decision to remove ORVs from WSA. Now the Forest Service should complete the job by banning motorcycles and mountain bikes. While there's room on the Gallatin for many types of recreation, the WSA should be protected from mechanized use.	HPBH WSA	The Forest recognized in the mid 1990's that certain activities within the HPBH WSA were having a negative effect on wilderness character circa 1977. Specifically activities (like ATV use) that were converting single track trails to double track trails had a tangible effect. This travel plan considered those effects and issues tied to recreational use of all sorts within the study area. Alternative 7M proposes to allow only motorcycles on certain trails within the HPBH from July 15 - Sept. 5 to ensure that wilderness character is preserved and that motorized use does not expand to all areas within the study area. Alternative 6 evaluated the effect of managing the entire WSA as non-motorized. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Nike G. Stevens		1046		the study area should be managed for nonmotorized recreation and wildlife habitats. Hyalite Lake and Emerald Lake trails should not be open to motorcycles and the Buffalo Horn should not be open for snowmobile use the wilderness character of these areas needs to be preserved in order to maintain their value for future wilderness	HPBH WSA	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				designation.		Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Jim Barrett		881		Ban motorcycles and mtn bikes to be consistent w/ and to retain wilderness values	HPBH WSA	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Rene Colucci		898	New York	Hyalite Porcupine-Buffalo Horn needs to be ORV free to keep potential for wilderness character and thus its potential for wilderness designation.	HPBH WSA	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						(1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Bob Ebinger/ Robin Hoggan Ebinger		906	Livingston	I support the FS decision to remove motorized from the Porcupine-Buffalo Horn WSA to be consistent w/ and to retain wilderness values.	HPBH WSA	Alternative 6 is the only alternative that proposes to remove all motorized use from the HPBH. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Robert Gresswell		919	Bozeman	Hyalite, Porcupine-Buffalo Horn wilderness areas should be cherished and protected. Off -trail motorized activity has trashed many once-pristine areas.	HPBH WSA	We agree that the HPBH is a special area that must be protected. The preferred alternative would limit all summer motorized use to designated routes prohibiting off trail travel. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Decision maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Paul Herbel		927	Bozeman	A current year-round, no restrictions in the Porcupine-Buffalo Horn WSA to 7/15 - 9/7 window of less than 8 weeks is terrible. Over concentration on very little trail miles and in a 7 week riding season will cause overuse and awful congestion of those remaining areas. Tepee Creek trail #39 must stay open to keep me out of the 320 Ranch; it provides vista views into YNP and additional access to Ramshorn Lake area trails.	HPBH WSA	The preferred alternative identifies a number of open motorcycle routes that would be available to the public from July 15 - Sept. 5. These seasonal restrictions are designed to protect the trail facility in the spring (much of this area hold snow well into July) and to provide secure grizzly bear habitat in the fall. The preferred alternative would not provide access on the Tepee Ck. Trail #39 for motorcycles, rather the access to the area would be through Buffalo Horn or Porcupine. This proposal is designed to improve natural integrity and provide critical secure wildlife habitat in the southern portions of the area. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Anne Johnson		934	Bozeman	The Hyalite Porcupine-Buffalo Horn and Lionhead WSAs should be off limits to motorized traffic. Solitude in a wild natural setting is an under-appreciated resource that will become more and more important and scarce in the coming decades. We should protect it as a spiritual as well as an economic value for ourselves and our children.	HPBH WSA	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Alternative 7M proposes to manage the Lionhead recommended wilderness for non-motorized uses. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Curtis Meyer		950	Bozeman	Hyalite-Porcupine-Buffalo Horn WSA should be motor-free to protect the Yellowstone ecosystem, grizzly bear habitat and wilderness character. Motorized travel is noisy. Motorized travel on trails promotes more "pioneered" trails. Motorized travel brings more trash deeper into the forest. Motorized travel promotes the spread of noxious weeds and disrupts wildlife. Motorized trails make poor hiking trails.	HPBH WSA	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Gretchen Rupp		969	Bozeman	Prohibit motorized travel w/in the Hyalite-Porcupine-Buffalo Horn WSA. This entire area should be off limits to motorized use so that it can serve its essential role as habitat for rare wildlife species.	HPBH WSA	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jeffrey Ball		1002	Bozeman	Hyalite Buffalo-Horn WSA must be kept motor free until be can resolve national legislation to formally set the area into wilderness.	HPBH WSA	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Kerry White		1616		Judge Malloy ruled to have this area returned to 1977 use and ATVs at that time were allowed. 3-wheelers because of their instability were replaced by 4-wheelers as required by law, so I maintain that 4-wheelers should be allowed in this area.	HPBH WSA	Judge Molloy's ruling (which was appealed and has been remanded back to his court) found that wilderness character circa 1977 must be maintained. The trails within the HPBH in 1977 were single track routes. ATV use that developed after designation created double track routes that were not present in 1977, and clearly

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						not in keeping with the mandate to maintain existing wilderness character. The preferred alternative would prohibit all ATV use within the HPBH.
David R. Stevens		1045	Bozeman	The wilderness character of these areas needs to be preserved in order to maintain their value for future wilderness designation.	HPBH WSA	We agree.
Jenny McCune	Gallatin Valley Bicycle Club	762	Bozeman	The Wilderness Study Area - mountain bikes, which carry the same level of impact both in terms of noise and trail damage as hikers, should be permitted. I would hope that the Forest Service would and asked me to choose between maintaining a quiet motor free environment and my mountain biking.	HPBH WSA	Alternative 7M proposes to allow mountain bikes on all trails that would be open to motorcycles, and on several non-motorized routes. Please see the summer non-motorized maps for the proposed open mountain bike routes. Please see the Decision maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of uses in the HBPH.
Shelly Watters and Steve Malmberg		1602		The HPBH WSA should be managed as wilderness. Any continued motorized use of the area will cause more environmental degradation. In order to protect the wilderness character of this area, it should be managed for non-motorized use only.	HPBH WSA	Congress in designating wilderness study areas under S. 393 did not mandate that these areas be managed "as wilderness", but rather to maintain existing wilderness character and future designation potential. Early versions of S. 393 that did propose to manage WSAs as though they were Wilderness were rejected by Congress for the current version. Alternative 6 would prohibit all motorized and mechanized recreation use in the HPBH WSA. The preferred alternative would allow some motorized and mechanized use consistent with maintaining wilderness character circa 1977. Please see the Decision maps and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of motorized and non-motorized uses in the HPBH.
Chris Anderson		34		I use the Hyalite area almost exclusively. That's more than 32 years. More than 4,500 trips up the entire drainage. More than 600 snowmobile trips in the upper drainages. I've seen only 4 people on foot, in the winter, above 7500' of elevation in those 32 years. I've never seen a conflict yet. Please call me if you need an advisor about the Hyalite or North Gallatin Crest areas, especially snowmobiling.	Hyalite	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Robert Boik		887		I have noticed damage from motorized use in the Hyalite area, Porcupine-Buffalo Horn area, in the Crazies and in the Livingston Peak areas. Most of these trails are closed to motorized use, but the closures are widely ignored.	Hyalite	Several of the trails you note in your comment are currently open to motorized uses. We recognize that some riders will ignore motorized regulations, but we intend to provide better user information/education and maps to improve compliance as we implement the travel plan.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Edwin Bowers		889		Vehicle access, year-round to the end of the Hyalite road, with limited snowmobile/off road vehicle use would be fair to all parties interested.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a snowmobile trail to the Grotto Falls Trailhead that provides access to rental cabins and ice climbing. The drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. Please see the 7M winter map.
Beverly Dawson		904	Livingston	It is a great idea to plow to Chisholm up Hyalite. This opens many options for x-c ski use and ice climbing.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to Heather/Emerald Basin, rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Further evaluation pointed out how limiting parking would be at Chisholm and how much additional cost there would be to plow that additional distance, precipitating this change in the final preferred alternative. Plan B would be to plow as far as Langohr Campground, providing snowmobile parking at Moser, and skier parking at Langohr. Plan C would be to plow to the lower fishing access, with a shared snowmobile/xc ski trail as far as the Moser junction, where snowmobiles would leave the main road for the designated snowmobile trail, and skiers would use the main road south of Langohr. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Terry Johnson		935	Bozeman	Hyalite Reservoir area has the potential to become the best winter sports area in the country. What is needed is a plan for developing a winter sports complex.	Hyalite	We concur that Hyalite has the potential to provide outstanding winter recreation opportunities. Alternative 7M proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a snowmobile trail to the Grotto Falls Trailhead that provides access to rental cabins and ice climbing. The drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. Please see the 7M winter map. A specific

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						winter sports complex plan as you recommend is outside the scope of this decision, but may be appropriate at some time in the future when considering all dispersed recreation management in the drainage.
Marshall Swearingen		982	Bozeman	The Hyalites are a lush, alpine environment is much more susceptible to damage by motorized use. I have witnessed damage done to high meadows and lakes (such as Emerald Lake and the Hyalite Peak area) by irresponsible motorized use. Closure of this area would be consistent w/ your proposal to ban snowmobiles in Hyalite Canyon and plow the road in the winter. The Bridgers are less susceptible to damage resulting from motorized use, are a more isolated range w/out wilderness potential and are already heavily damaged b/c of motorized, so this area could have more motorized added to it.	Hyalite	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Noreen Breeding		1004	Bozeman	Hood Creek would make a good hiking trail b/c it connects w/ non-motorized trail #462.	Hyalite	All alternatives propose to manage the trails in the Hood Creek area as open to motorized uses as they are today. We are unsure of what non-motorized connector trail you are referring to in your comment - there is no trail 462 in the vicinity of Hood Creek.
Anne Banks	BWAGS	1177	Bozeman	Plowing the Hyalite road to Chisholm Campground and closing the drainage to snowmobiling offers a marvelous opportunity for family oriented winter recreation - cross country skiing, snowshoeing, sledding and other snow play. Previous experience with plowing shows that it must begin as soon as the first snow falls: otherwise, drivers, particularly hunters with high clearance rigs, will create such deep, hard packed ruts that plowing them out is impossible and drivers with lesser vehicles will be unable to negotiate the ruts.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to Heather/Emerald Basin, rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Further evaluation pointed out how limiting parking would be at Chisholm and how much additional cost there would be to plow that additional distance, precipitating this change in the final preferred alternative. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Mark Weirich	Citizens for Balanced Use	89	Bozeman	The trails that I would most like to remain motorized are the existing crest route from Red Canyon to Hyalite and all existing motorized trails close to town (Bozeman) which I can ride after work. I am a motorcyclist and enjoy the ore challenging single track trails.	Hyalite	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Kerry White		1616		434 to Emerald and Heather Lakes and trail 427 to Hyalite Lake. These two trails are probably my favorite to ride in the winter. I have met some cross-country skiers on these trails and every time they were happy to have snowmobile tracks to ski on.	Hyalite	Alternatives 1,2 and 3 evaluated managing both of these areas for snowmobiling. Alternative 7M would manage a designated snowmobile trail to the Heather Emerald Basin, though the Main Hyalite drainage would be closed to snowmobiles. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter configuration in Hyalite.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Backcountry Snowmobile Access - Leave main road & trail open for snowmobile access to Hyalite Lake area and Emerald & Heather Lake area. This is very important country to local snomobilers.	Hyalite	Alternative 1 considered leaving the main road and access to Hyalite Peak open to snowmobiles, with now plowing. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative would manage a designated snowmobile trail to the Heather Emerald Basin, though the Main Hyalite drainage would be closed to snowmobiles. The preferred alternative would plow the road to the Blackmore Day Use site, to provide access for xc skiing. Snowmobile access would be from a designated trail that leave from the Moser Ck. junction providing access to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and the East Fork of Hyalite, and an open area for snowmobiling between the Moser Road and the Main Hyalite road to the north. See the winter map. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter configuration in Hyalite.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Snowmobilers prefer Hyalite road remain as is (no plowing). If the road is plowed and funds run out prior to end of season snowmobilers prefer allowed use to revert back as it is today.	Hyalite	Alternative 1 considered leaving the main road and access to Hyalite Peak open to snowmobiles, with now plowing. Alternative 7M proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a snowmobile trail to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and the East Fork of Hyalite that provides access to Heather/Emerald Basin, rental cabins and ice climbing. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter configuration in Hyalite, and a description of different plowing scenarios in the event that funds are not sufficient to plow to Blackmore all winter.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Pat Simmons	Sierra Club	1545		Hyalite Trail #427 and East Fork Hyalite Trail #434 - These trails should remain motor-free. They are extremely popular among hikers, horseback riders and mountain bikers and are incompatible with motorized use. Generally these trails are narrow and will not support extensive motorized use. This is a safety concern.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M proposes to manage these trails as open to motorcycles and mountain bikes. Motorcycles would be allowed from July 15 - Sept. 5. These trails would also be managed under a time share scenario where they would be closed to motorized use on certain days. Several other alternatives considered managing these routes as none motorized (please see Chapter 3, Recreation Effects). Please see the Record of Decision for a description of the time share proposal.
Pat Simmons	Sierra Club	1545		Plowing to the reservoir is a great idea, but only as long as snowmobiles are kept out of the canyon. An alternative to plowing to the reservoir is to plow to mile marker #6 at the Langhor Campground. The county already plows to mile marker #2 thereby shortening the FS plow mileage to 4 miles. This will, for the first time, provide an area for family traditional recreation pursuits near Bozeman.	Hyalite	Alternatives 5 and 6 evaluated plowing to the reservoir and managing the entire drainage as closed to snowmobiles. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to Heather/Emerald Basin, rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Further evaluation pointed out how limiting parking would be at Chisholm and how much additional cost there would be to plow that additional distance, precipitating this change in the final preferred alternative. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Pat Simmons	Sierra Club	1545		We would like to see hiking emphasized, without motorized travel, on more trails in Hyalite. The Hood Lick Trail, Wildhorse Trail, and Lick Creek Trail are more amenable to non-motorized use than motorized. These trails cross several small streams that flow into the reservoir and are subject to significant motorized damage.	Hyalite	We believe it is important to provide a variety of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities in the Hyalite area. The Hood/Lick loops are proposed in the preferred alternative to be managed as open to ATV/motorcycles. The History Rock, Blackmore, Westshore, Crescent Lake, and trail 171 would be managed exclusively for non-motorized uses in the summer. The decision is also considering "time share" on the East Fork and Main Hyalite trails - which are proposed to be open to motorcycles from July 15 - Sept.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						5. On certain days of the week or similar configuration, these routes would be managed as closed to motorized use. Please see the Record of Decision for the details regarding "time share" trails.
Derrick C. Monson		1031	Belgrade	Restricting winter motorized use in the Hyalite area will prevent a vast majority of its users from accessing the high elevation mountain area in the winter. Snowmobiling, ice climbing, and backcountry skiing are activities that fully or at least partially rely on motorized access.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to Heather/Emerald Basin, rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Further evaluation pointed out how limiting parking would be at Chisholm and how much additional cost there would be to plow that additional distance, precipitating this change in the final preferred alternative. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Jed Statz		1044		Allow access to the high country, Emerald, Hyalite lakes, via a snowmobile as I have enjoyed for years. The proposition seven says that Hyalite is not managed for wildlife. Therefore it is imperative to allow snowmobiling.	Hyalite	Alternatives 1-3 evaluated managing the "high country" of the Hyalite area for snowmobiling. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to Heather/Emerald Basin, rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Patricia Hedrick		1326	Bozeman	Hyalite to Hyalite Lake was the same experience. If riders want these areas then no thrills, mufflers, speed control, 10 mph max, some sort of registration so bike and rider can be identified, motor always defers to non-motor, no off trail or wider than current trail.	Hyalite	Under the preferred alternative 7M the main Hyalite trail is proposed to be open to motorcycles from July 15 - Sept. 5. In addition, this trail would be managed under a "time share" scenario - where the trail would be closed to motorcycles during portions of the week. The State of Montana regulates motorcycle registration, we have no authority to do so. Many of your suggestions are excellent riding etiquette ideas, and will be emphasized in the "On the Right Trail" information and education work during travel plan implementation. Please see the Record of Decision for more details on the "time share" decision.
Emily DeLuca	BWAGs	501	Bozeman	The Hyalites offer absolutely wonderful x-c ski possibilities, from Moser to all accesses farther south, and it is grand that they will be non-motorized. But if Hyalite Rd. is not plowed, they will be essentially non-accessible, and then the offer is meaningless.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Further evaluation pointed out how limiting parking would be at Chisholm and how much additional cost there would be to plow that additional distance, precipitating this change in the final preferred alternative. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Will Robertson		304		It sounds like leaving Hyalite road closed to vehicles from March 30 through May 15 would be somewhat necessary during the spring thaw, but it will also make cyclists, runners, and roller bladers happy.	Hyalite	Thank you for your comment. The preferred alternative would close the Hyalite road to all motor vehicles between March 31 and May 15. The primary goal is to protect the road facility, but we are aware this also will provide an early spring biking and skating opportunity.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Neil G. Westesen	Bridger Ski Foundation Nordic Biathlon Team	323	Bozeman	First, BSF applauds the recommendation to plow Hyalite road and restrict snowmobile access during the winter months. Similarly, BSF supports the restrictions on motorized use in Bozeman Creek, Bear Canyon and South Cottonwood Canyon. These areas are all suitable for outstanding winter recreational use and in particular Nordic skiing.	Hyalite	The Forest recognized early in the planning process the shortage of family friendly front country xc skiing opportunities that were non-motorized. The preferred alternative would manage much of the Hyalite drainage, the first several miles of Bear Canyon, Bozeman Creek, South Cottonwood, and the southeast corner of the Bridgers as closed to snowmobiles, with an emphasis on xc skiing and snowshoeing opportunities. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter configuration in Hyalite.
Neil G. Westesen	Bridger Ski Foundation Nordic Biathlon Team	323		The Forest Service publication "Ski Touring in the National Forest" identifies several trails around Hyalite reservoir, Wildhorse Creek and Lick Creek, as well as Moser Creek and Bozeman Creek. Historically, the trails have been machine groomed for cross-country ski racing, including a national level biathlon competition in the late 1970s. We are willing to groom the existing roads and trails pursuant to a Forest Service volunteer agreement and cooperative management between BSF and the Forest Service. In particular, BSF is interested in grooming ski trails on Moser Creek Road, the roads around Hyalite reservoir, Langhor Creek Road, the Lick Creek Road, the Hood Creek Road, and the trail from History Rock to the dam. In addition, the roads within a number of the area campgrounds could easily be groomed for skate and classic skiing without the need for any additional trail maintenance work.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M proposes to manage many of these routes as xc ski trails. On the winter maps, they are identified as marked routes, but could be considered for grooming as well. We chose not to identify every route as groomed in the preferred alternative, but noted that they may be managed as either marked or groomed in the future. Grooming is considered a maintenance issue, and not one that is decided in the travel plan. Please see the record of decision for the final winter configuration in Hyalite.
Thomas Pick		329		The Hyalite area proposal is good, except I'd like to suggest that in the future motorbike use be monitored closely to evaluate the impacts of this use on other users and the natural resources associated with the adjacent Gallatin Crest high altitude trail system.	Hyalite	Thank you for your comment. Please see Appendix B of Volume One of the FEIS for details on our monitoring outlines.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301		Hyalite: and limiting motorized use in winter to the main road and the trails to Palisades Falls in Hyalite Creek Trailhead will provide opportunity for winter motorized use while opening up opportunities for quiet trail use. However, much of the middle portion of the drainage is not heavily used by a wildlife and may support a designated play area of located away from the main road and cross-country ski trails.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1301		we would like to see hiking emphasized on more trails in Hyalite. Specifically, the Hood Lick (436), Wildhorse and Lick Creek Trails should be designated non-motorized. We support the proposal to continue the use of South Cottonwood 442, and Blackmore 423 trails as nonmotorized. The lower drainage, outside the to the WSA, is extremely popular with hikers, horseback riders, mountain bikers and runners, and the upper drainage, inside the WSA, is considered by biologists to be the most secure wildlife habitat for elk and grizzly bear.	Hyalite	We believe it is important to provide a variety of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities in the Hyalite area. The Hood/Lick loops are proposed in the preferred alternative to be managed as open to ATV/motorcycles. The History Rock, Blackmore, Westshore, Crescent Lake, and trail 171 would be managed exclusively for non-motorized uses in the summer. The decision is also considering "time share" on the East Fork and Main Hyalite trails - which are proposed to be open to motorcycles from July 15 - Sept. 5. On certain days of the week or similar configuration, these routes would be managed as closed to motorized use. Please see the Record of Decision for the details regarding "time share" trails.
Greg Beardslee		737		I propose that the Gallatin National Forest take the leading create a contour trail from Hyalite Creek North to Trail Creek, carefully skirting around the private sections, to allow people access to this part of the forest. This route to provide an ongoing lesson for the public and fire recovery. The proposed connector trail around Bald Knob in the upper Bear Canyon/Trail Creek, will make a good first step in this direction. Right now, this area is not being managed, it is being ignored like a pesky child. The travel plan should show more vision here.	Hyalite	The new trail you describe is not proposed in any alternatives, however a new connector route from Bear Lakes to Trail Cr./West Pine is part of the preferred alternative. This route would be managed for foot and stock use, and would provide access to this area.
David Bechberger		738		Winter access to the Hyalite drainage:I like the current plan of plowing the road up to Hyalite Lake. My concern is what is going to happen if funds are not available to plow the road. I am afraid that motorized traffic will still not be allowed up the road. This would effectively block off a very popular winter	Hyalite	The preferred alternative 7M still proposes to plow the Hyalite road to the Blackmore Day Use site. The Record of Decision will articulate several other plowing scenarios should funds be insufficient to plow the entire winter. Please see the Record of Decision for this information.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				recreation area. I hope at a minimum that motorized access would be allowed on the road only up to the dam.		
Nick, Kristy, Nicole, Brett, Meghan Kronfuss		1381	Bozeman	The Hyalite road runs directly through the middle of the area you want to close off to snowmobiles. The quiet users already have the drainage to the East (Sourdough) and the drainage to the West (Cottonwood) which is closed to snowmobiles. Keep in mind that the main road runs directly to the center of this area. It is not a quiet area now with vehicles having access. Keep Hyalite, Lick Creek, and it Wild Horse, open to snowmobiles and four wheelers. These are established roads and not trails and a closing for specific group.	Hyalite	The Forest recognizes that Hyalite provides many opportunities for a variety of recreation activities. In the summer, the Lick Ck/Wildhorse loops would be managed for four wheelers under the preferred alternative. Alternatives 1-3 considered managing the area much as you propose in your comment. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Robb Larson		1391	Bozeman	The proposed travel plan should be modified to continue to permit mountain biking on the Emerald Lake Trail in the Hyalite drainage, and in the South Cottonwood Creek drainage - at least to the Fox Creek Trail Junction. Additionally, the Fox Creek Connector between Hyalite and South Cottonwood should remain open to bicycling. These trails provide ideal training challenge that is greatly enjoyed by advanced mountain bicyclists. They are utilized by a large number of such cyclist each season, due to the nature of the trail surface, the trail gradients, and the proximity to the city of Bozeman.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative would allow mountain bike travel on these routes.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness	1440		If the plan to plow the road is not successful, opportunities for skiers and snowshoers may be	Hyalite	The preferred alternative 7M proposes to plow the Hyalite road to the Blackmore Day Use site. The Record

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter			further limited by this plan rather than expanded. Where are skiers to go if the plan to plow the Hyalite road is not implemented due to funding or other issues?		of Decision will articulate several other plowing scenarios should funds be insufficient to plow the entire winter. Plan B would be to plow as far as Langohr Campground, providing snowmobile parking at Moser, and skier parking at Langohr. Plan C would be to plow to the lower fishing access, with a shared snowmobile/xc ski trail as far as the Moser junction, where snowmobiles would leave the main road for the designated snowmobile trail, and skiers would use the main road south of Langohr. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion on winter uses in Hyalite. The preferred alternative also identified several other non-motorized xc ski opportunities close to Bozeman - Sourdough Ck. , South Cottonwood, lower Bear Canyon, and the Middle and South Forks of Brackett Creek. These areas would provide alternative non-motorized winter opportunities to Hyalite.
Tom Morton		1446	Bozeman	Winter Benchmark for motorized travel is unclear about snowmobile access to Hyalite peak, it appears that the travel planning area boundary ends at the trail head. What does that mean? Is the trail still open as it is now or does that mean the trail and access to the area is to be closed under the new management plan? I would like to see the Hyalite peak area open to snowmobiles during the winter season. The majority of the terrain in the area is unsuitable for snowmobiles except the Hyalite peak basin. This area represents a fraction of the acreage available to non-motorized recreationists. During the winter 80% of the visitors to the area venture less than 2 miles from their car.	Hyalite	In the preferred alternative 7M snowmobiles would not be permitted in the upper portions of the Main Hyalite drainage near Hyalite Peak. Providing snowmobile access to this area was considered in alternatives 1-3. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Chris Naumann		1454		I support the plowing of the road to the east fork and Chisholm campground even if the only way to	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				generate sufficient funds included a user fee. Until a perpetual funding source is secured, I would like to see the road remain open to vehicles - no gate - as it is now. Road plowed or not, I would like to see the rest of Alt. 7s provisions implemented...the snowmobile closure to enhance the overall backcountry experience of cross-country skiing, ice fishing, snowshoeing, family sledding, and ice climbing.		and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Chris Naumann		1454		Due to the popularity of the following trails with family-oriented non-motorized use (hiking often involving children and dogs, trail running and mountain biking), I think the following trails should be designated as non-motorized: Hyalite Lake Trail #427, Emerald Lake Trail #434.	Hyalite	Several alternatives considered managing these trails as closed to motorized use. The preferred alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on these routes between July 15 and Sept. 5. During this open time, a "time share" scenario is being considered where the trails would be closed to motorized use some days of the week. Please see the Record of Decision for the final description of "time share" trails.
Sandy Newsome		1458	Wyoming	The proposed Travel Plan will effectively keep any ice climbers without a snowmobile from accessing the ice climbing in the canyon. The alternative is to keep the roads open to vehicles to the current parking lots at Grotto Falls and Palisade Falls.	Hyalite	The preferred alternative recognized how important reasonable access for ice climbing is in the Hyalite area, but also places an emphasis on providing safe family friendly xc skiing opportunities. Alternative 7M proposes to plow the road to the Blackmore Day Use site, and allow wheeled vehicles above the dam until Jan. 1. Additionally, a designated snowmobile access route to the Grotto Falls trailhead would be provided from the Moser Road Junction. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about road plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow all winter.
Joe Polus		1487		Back Country Snowmobile Access: Leave main road and trail open for snowmobile access to Hyalite Lake area and emerald & Heather Lake area. This is very important country to local snowmobilers.	Hyalite	Alternatives 1-3 considered your proposal. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						Hyalite to provide access to Heather/Emerald Basin, rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Joe Polus		1487		Leave open the corridor that allows access to the upper Hyalite Lake and Emerald and Heather areas.	Hyalite	In the preferred alternative 7M snowmobiles would not be permitted in the upper portions of the Main Hyalite drainage near Hyalite Peak. Providing snowmobile access to this area was considered in alternatives 1-3. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to Heather/Emerald Basin, rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Conrad Anker		637	Bozeman	If snow machines are excluded from this canyon the road would best serve users by being maintained to the Chisholm Campground. In addition to ice	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				climbing, winter skiing opportunities would be possible.		closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		Hyalite Trail #427 and East Fork Hyalite Trail #434 are two of the most popular trails on the Forest for non-motorized use. The proposal to designate both for unlimited motorcycle use for the next 15-20 years is clearly in conflict with current uses.	Hyalite	Several alternatives considered managing these trails as closed to motorized use. The preferred alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on these routes between July 15 and Sept. 5. During this open time, a "time share" scenario is being considered where the trails would be closed to motorized use some days of the week to provide non-motorized opportunities. Please see the Record of Decision for the final description of "time share" trails.
Robb Goodell		663	Bozeman	If the road to Hyalite Reservoir is plowed great! Put no snowmobiles in Hyalite Canyon, the noise carries a long way in this canyon and is incredibly disruptive in winter.	Hyalite	Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 evaluated plowing the road and managing the entire drainage as closed to snowmobiles. In response to public comments, alternative 7M would provide some limited snowmobiling opportunities in the lower portion of the drainage, and access to Heather/Emerald Basin, rental cabins and popular ice climbing above Grotto Falls. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter configuration in Hyalite.
Anita Strawn de Ojeda		679		Closing Hyalite and then spending $90,000 to keep it plowed seems like a waste of money. What about a compromise? Keep it plowed to the Langhor campground area (the hill across from the campground is a favorite with sledders) and close it to everything but skiers and snowmobilers. There are plenty of side roads and trails for snowmobilers and skiers to peacefully coexist from this point on.	Hyalite	Alternative 4 considered your proposal, and it would be an alternative plowing scenario in the event that funding were insufficient to plow the road all winter to Blackmore Day Use site as proposed in the preferred alternative. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes to plow the Hyalite Road to the Blackmore Day Use area, and provide a designated snowmobile trail through a closed area to the Grotto Falls Trailhead and East Fork of Hyalite to provide access to Heather/Emerald Basin,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						rental cabins and ice climbing. This trail would leave from the Moser Ck junction (please see the winter Alternative 7M map) and would be managed to protect non-motorized xc ski opportunities around the reservoir. Most of the drainage would be managed primarily for non-motorized winter opportunities. This is a change from the preferred alternative in the DEIS where we proposed to plow to Chisholm campground, and not allow any snowmobile access in the canyon. Additionally, an area lower in the canyon between Moser Road and the Main Hyalite Road would be open to snowmobiling. Please see the Record of Decision for the final winter management configuration in Hyalite, and discussions about plowing scenarios should there be insufficient funds to plow year long.
Noreen Breeding		454		The chart contains several errors in Alternative 7. Hyalite Road #62, segment 3 is to be plowed, but skiing and snowshoeing are emphasized on it. On segment 4, no restrictions May 16 - Dec 1 for motorized vehicles is written. Does this mean that it is closed Dec. 2 - May 15 or that ATVs can drive on this unplowed segment all winter?	Hyalite	Thank you for noting these errors - they have been corrected in the FEIS. In the preferred alternative, the main road would be plowed to the Blackmore Day use site, and wheeled vehicles allowed on the road above the dam until January 1. Please see the detailed description of the alternatives for dates. Please see the Record of Decision for final winter management proposals, and alternative plowing scenarios.
Noreen Breeding		454		ATV use should be closed before Dec 1, preferably around Nov 1. In 2004, ATVs were still driving around locked gates and up Moser Creek, Lick Creek, and Wildhorse roads throughout December, ruining ski trails.	Hyalite	The preferred alternative would allow ATV's on designated routes only from June 15 to Dec. 2. The travel plan proposes to begin active management of ski trails after December 2, at which time wheeled vehicles would be prohibited on ski trails.
Noreen Breeding		454		The first few miles of Blackmore Trail (#423) in alternative 7 are shown on the map as hiking/stock only, yet the rest of the trail allows bicycles. This is unworkable. Bicycles should be prohibited inside the WSA, all the way to Blackmore Peak and beyond to the Fox Park Cabin in S. Cottonwood Canyon, as proposed in Alt. 5.	Hyalite	This was a map error and has been corrected in the FEIS. This preferred alternative proposes to allow mountain bikes on the Blackmore/S. Cottonwood loop.
Quint Gidley		1799	Livingston	The first issue of concern is the trail closures that apply to mountain bikes. I realize that the Hyalite lake and Emerald Lake trails are in a proposed WSA but until these areas are set aside as wilderness, I see no legal reason to close these trails to bikes. The user conflicts that are occurring over these trails need to be addressed through educating all trail users on proper trail etiquette.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M would allow mountain bikes on these trails. In the final decision, consideration is being given to applying a "time share" concept to mountain bikes on these routes as well as to motorcycles, where on certain days of the week, bikes would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final description of the "time share" concept as it relates to bicycles close to Bozeman.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Bruce Brock		1208		Perhaps alternative use by motorized and quiet traffic in all seasons could work, by area or by the calendar. That is: Trails east of the creek could be motorized and west quiet for a period (mo. Or such) then trade. Require all motorized vehicles to have factory mufflers. Modified ones do the earsplitting. Require that dogs be kept on leashes, certainly frighten both birds and game, surprise or sometimes intimidate other trail users.	Hyalite	Several of the trails in the Hyalite area are being considered for "time share" for motorcycles and mountain bikes in the final decision. Please see the Record of Decision for the final description of the "time share" concept as it relates to bicycles close to Bozeman. The State of Montana regulates muffler requirements - all trail vehicles are required to have mufflers that muffle sound to no louder than 70dbA (see the Noise section in Chapter 3 for more information). Requiring that dogs be kept on leashes is outside of the scope of this decision.
Andy Copeland		1245		The Hyalite Peak trail should be managed for hiking, biking, and stock use.	Hyalite	Several alternatives considered managing this trail as closed to motorized use. The preferred alternative 7M would allow motorcycles on this trail between July 15 and Sept. 5. During this open time, a "time share" scenario is being considered where on certain days of the week or some other configuration, the trail would be closed to motorized and mechanized uses. Please see the Record of Decision for the final decision on "time shared" trails.
Dennis Zindler		873		Trail 427 - Hyalite - Motorized - Summer and winter - leave open - This is good for all, fishing, hiking, riding, viewing the falls, etc.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative would allow motorcycles on this trail from July 15 - Sept. 5. During that time, we are considering managing this route as a "time shared" trail, where on certain days of the week or some other configuration, the trail would be closed to motorized and mechanized uses. Please see the Record of Decision for the final decision on "time shared" trails.
Todd Orr		840		527 - Hyalite Peak - Suggest separating/relocating the handicap access trail and the motorized trail to reduce conflicts. Currently, they cross each others paths. Longer single track trails such as this are very important for a reasonable length and rewarding motorcycle ride. Also an important route for many mountain bikes connecting to Squaw Creek.	Hyalite	Thank you for this suggestion. It is one we are considering as we implement the travel plan.
John Criger		107	Lakewood, CO	The area is close to town and subject to many user groups. It is a good idea for folks with aspiring different uses to learn to get along. Some physical separation of activities is acceptable but users need to understand to concept of quit isn't totally possible.	Hyalite	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Chris Anderson		128	Bozeman	You have grand ideas up Hyalite. Wait till it really snows in the future. If you insist to close snowmobiles in the Hyalite drainage then at least open either Bozeman Creek or Cottonwood Creek for snowmobiling. If you want to save gas and oil, keep snowmobiling up Hyalite.	Hyalite	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Ian Foley		196	Bozeman	Hyalite Canyon should remain "multi- use". There is no reason to exclude users from Hyalite Creek, or Emerald lake trails. A hiker has the potential to startle wildlife just as much as a mountain bike.	Hyalite	Alternative 7M the preferred alternative would manage most of the trails within the Hyalite drainage as "multi use". Mountain bikes would be permissible on all routes accept the accessible trails to Palisade and Grotto Falls. See the summer motorized and summer non-motorized maps for alternative 7M.
Alison Gidley		236	Livingston	My biggest mountain bike concerns are with proposed closures of trails around Hyalite Canyon and the East Fork of Hyalite Creek, the side trails around Big Creek (specifically Lewis creek) off of the Hyalite Divide, and the Porcupine Buffalo Horn area. These trails should remain open to mountain bikers without any stipulations on which days people can ride. I am also in favor of any logical mountain bike trails or improvements on existing trails, which could potentially minimize and disperse traffic from some of the heavy use areas without having to close trails. The Bangtail Divide trail is a great example of a trail built with mountain bikes in mind and it is definitely appreciated.	Hyalite	The preferred alternative would allow mountain bikes on the Hyalite Peak trail #427, the Heather and Emerald Trails, Porcupine Buffalo Horn loops, and several of the Big Creek side trails. The Lewis Creek Trail is proposed to be closed to mountain bikes in this alternative, though alternatives 1-3 considered managing this trail for bikes. The preferred alternative is considering a "time share" concept for heavily used popular trails close to Bozeman, including Hyalite Peak and Heather/Emerald. Under this scenario, motorized and mechanized uses would be allowed only on certain days. Please see the Record of Decision for the final decision regarding "time share". Through the travel planning process, we certainly placed emphasis on improving mountain biking opportunities by identifying routes where biking will be a focus.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		North Fork Elk Creek Trail #195 presents another enforcement problem. We support the proposal to designate the trail as motor free, but note that there will be a serious enforcement problem at this trail's intersection with the Trespass Creek Trail if the FS allows snowmobile use of this trail as proposed.	Ibex	In the preferred alternative, Trail # 195 would be closed to snowmobiles. Please see the alternative 7M winter map.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		The proposal for the partially motorized, partially motor free trails on the west slope of the Crazies (Trails #197, 268 and 270) creates an impractical	Ibex	Alternative 7M proposed to provide a mix of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities in the Crazies. Trail #270 - Rock Creek - is proposed to be

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				enforcement situation. Who is going to make sure that machines are being turned around where they are supposed to?		open to motorcycles, this is a dead end trail with many terrain limitations - we do not anticipate enforcement problems along this route. Trail #268 - Trespass Creek is proposed to be a managed for foot, bicycle and stock travel only in the preferred alternative. ATV's and motorcycles would be permissible to the private land boundary in section 9 on Trail # 197 - which is a logical stopping point for motorized use. Users are responsible for knowing which routes are designated as open to motorized use, and travel off of those routes would be prohibited.
Andy Hopkins		930	Saratoga Springs UT	The FS claims they do not have the funds for trail maintenance and trail building. At the same time the FS refuses to work w/ local motorized groups to do just that for free. Take Rock Creek; a landowner complained about parking, so the Big Sky Snowriders volunteered to make a new parking lot w/ volunteer labor and are told no.	Issues	It is not accurate to state that the Forest Service "refuses to work with local motorized groups". Volunteer and partnership work with many local groups from the snowmobile clubs to the Backcountry Horsemen are an integral part of our annual trail maintenance programs.
Dale Tischmak		989	Fort Collins CO	The noise section states that the analysis is a qualitative discussion on the areas open to motorized. So where is the discussion? This text doesn't really include any meaningful analysis. A 6dB increase in sound quadruples the sound energy, it does not quadruple the sound loudness as the DEIS states. Vehicle noise is so temporary that the elimination of a few passbys over a weekend will have no significant or meaningful effect on the sound environment. The DEIS states that roads and trails in the forest are viewed as highways regarding noise and subject to the highway rules and regulations. The Federal Highway Administration and the Montana Department of Transportation have well developed policies for analyzing noise impacts from roads and highways that this DEIS totally ignores.	Issues	The noise analysis in the DEIS and in the FEIS provides a qualitative analysis of the noise issue. The section was updated in the FEIS - please see Chapter 3: Issue 15, Noise. Additional information was provided relative to noise monitoring and enforcement. A more rigorous quantitative analysis was not deemed necessary in the FEIS to adequately address this issue, within our current authorities. The effects of noise to some recreationists is very subjective and subject to personal interpretation. Although we treated this as a significant issue in the travel plan DEIS/FEIS, that was based more on public comment than our findings on the significance of effect.
Ken Zahn		1634		Trends in grazing and outfitter and guide operations other than the initial early period are not mentioned, i.e. they are not brought current for the reader. Expand the background to give a more balanced portrayal of both history and need for various multiple uses.	Issues	Outfitter and guide operations and the need for these services are outside the scope of this decision.
Linda Ellison		1070		It appears that OHV visitor data is not being collected because the agency does not want to quantify or recognize OHV use and popularity. This	Issues	OHV visitor data is collected, and was provided in the DEIS and in the FEIS. Please see Chapter 3: Issue 16 for the most current data on OHV use and trends.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				lack of data does not justify imposing this magnitude of impact on motorize recreationists. It is patently unfair to ignore the disparity in both quantity and quality of motorized versus non-motorized opportunities when evaluating such use against the mitigation for other resource values.		
Linda Ellison		1070		The level of use on individual trails needs to be evaluated for comparative purposes. The most valuable motorized routes these days are the ones that are remote and see less use. It is not fair that motorized recreationists practice "tread lightly" principles and are then penalized for that practice.	Issues	Travel plan decisions are primarily bounded by resource capability, and recreation goals and objectives. The interdisciplinary team did not feel that having specific use data was necessary to evaluate different alternatives and disclose the potential effects of those alternatives to the decision maker.
Linda Ellison		1070		It should not be assumed that all riders will deliberately break the rules. Agency managers have a responsibility to accurately and fairly determine the severity of problems being reported on a particular trail before proposing a management action which restricts a particular use. There is also an obligation to explore other measures such as visitor education which have not been as vigorously applied as they could be in most circumstances. I do not believe any of the requirements relative to implementing LAC guidelines before instigating closures have been met.	Issues	We concur, we do not believe nor are any of our proposals based on the assumption that all riders (of any recreation activity) will deliberately break the rules. On the other hand, in crafting alternatives we tried to provide opportunities that would be fulfilling and minimize temptation for violations. Facility issues rarely drove the development of alternatives, rather resource constraints or responding to social desire provided more guidance. Information and education efforts have been ongoing for decades. In some situations there is still a need to protect resources more assertively than in the past, despite these good efforts. LAC monitoring in wilderness has been an ongoing process for 15 years, providing some of the background information used to craft different alternatives in wilderness.
Tom Mandera	Montana 4x4 Association, Inc.	1097	Helena	Alt 7 is out of balance with future needs for motorized access and recreation. While statistics show the increase of motorized rec. will increase over the next decade, cumulative effects of proposed closures on all forests throughout the state should be taken into consideration.	Issues	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Pat Simmons	Sierra Club	1545	Bozeman	There appears to be no concern for population trends. Population growth in this area will be significant, yet that the plan only calculates trail usage based on today's recreational habits. The potential high level of increased motorized use is real even if the percentage of users types remains the	Issues	Chapter 3: Issue 16 - Recreation and Issue 5: Social and Economic Effects both look extensively at population trends, recreation trends and projections. This information was used heavily in crafting effects analysis and developing the different alternatives. We believe we have struck a good balance of recreation opportunities

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				same.		that are in sync with projected recreation trends in the proposed preferred alternative 7M.
Derrick C. Monson		1031	Belgrade	The GNF states in the DEIS that one of the purposes for a travel management plan is to: "Establish objectives and/or restrictions to correct any unacceptable resource damage that is occurring due to the use of Forest roads, trails, and areas open to cross-country travel." There is no possible way that all of the hiking, biking, horseback riding, motorcycling, atving, snowmobiling, skiing, snowshoeing, and all other recreational activities in the entire human history added up could even compare to the wildlife habitat destruction of one major forest fire.	Issues	Thank you for your comment. While we can appreciate your point, the effects of wildfires are largely a result of an uncontrollable natural phenomenon. Human use of public land and it's effect however, is within our control, and travel management weighs the effects of those uses with resource and social constraints.
Timothy L. Ravndal	Montana Multiple Use Association, Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1032		When roads are closed to motorized recreationists, then they in reality become a non-motorized recreational resource and they must be disclosed as such. Unfortunately this has not been evaluated and disclosed and the miles of recreational resources have been understated in favor of non-motorized recreationists. We request that the cumulative negative impact on motorized recreationists resulting from this lack of adequate accounting be evaluated and adequately mitigated as part of this project.	Issues	All areas of the Gallatin National Forest are available to foot travel at any time - not just closed roads. This analysis was designed to evaluate the effects of actively managed roads and trails that are within our system - and provides a reasonable comparison of those activities, not to evaluate every acres' potential to provide some sort of opportunity.
Timothy L. Ravndal	Montana Multiple Use Association, Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1032		We ask that this significant negative cumulative effect on motorized recreationists be adequately recognized, evaluated and mitigated at all levels starting with this project.	Issues	Cumulative effect of changing recreation opportunities was considered - please see Chapter 3: Issue 16 Recreation for more details of that analysis.
George Gallagher		1286		If in fact you continue to close areas to motorized recreation high validity expect to see a 50% reduction in staffing and budget why? There will be 70% less trails to be maintained which means you need less people and less equipment. (Please note: most trails are maintained by groups that use them. Not the forest service)	Issues	Thank you for your comment. We receive funding relative to the total number of miles of road or trail we manage, regardless of the use allocation. We do not anticipate any reduction in maintenance funds as a result of this proposal.
Sean Gallagher		1287	Bozeman	By closing additional areas it will force more people into smaller areas. Thus it will create more user conflicts than already exist today. There would be more wear in tear on trails that would be available under alternative seven. If additional areas are closed the economic impact to Gallatin County and	Issues	Chapter 3: Issue 5: Social and Economic Effects carefully considered the potential economic effects of all alternatives and concluded that any effect would be very minor on a local or regional scale. Please see that section. We acknowledge that certain alternatives would concentrate some uses into smaller areas, but we don't

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Montana will be unbearable.		necessarily agree that it will result in more user conflict. By providing opportunities for many activities, recreationists can choose where they wish to recreate and avoid areas where they feel their experience would not be optimal.
Thomas H. Gibson		1289		A lot of us love to hike, but a lot of us also use motorized access. Those two uses are compatible, because hikers already have select areas and wilderness where they can go for solitude if they so desire.	Issues	Thank you for your comment. Many people who provided feedback to use during this planning process disagree with your statement and asked us to provide segregated opportunities for both motorized and non-motorized recreation in a front country accessible setting.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		The documentation of existing uses, trends, and projections in the DEIS in his comprehensive and impressive. However, it appears to us that this information has not been integrated into the proposal. When we have asked how the agency can continue to provide quality non-motorized experiences over the life of the plan, given predicted population growth, unlimited OHV use on the trails where it is proposed to be allowed, and continuing increases in speed and power of OHV's, we have been told that these are not factors the Forest Service can predict. We urge you to make effective use of all this information; otherwise, this plan may end up creating more of the same problems it is intended to alleviate. We asked that, in the final EIS, the agency specifically document how the information on demographics, uses, trends, and projections is integrated into the final decision.	Issues	Your observations were noted, and changes made in the FEIS to address your concerns. Particularly please refer to the Record of Decision once it is completed. It will provide the rationale and tie back to critical information from the effects analysis that helped guide the final decision.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		The planning arguments for abandoning ROS standards are not convincing to us, especially in light of the heavy reliance on ROS for analyzing recreation in this plan. What will replace ROS as a clear, concise indication of management objectives for specific areas of the Forest?	Issues	The FEIS still proposes in Alternative 7M to drop the ineffective ROS language from the existing Forest Plan. It also proposes to add in the following two objectives for each travel planning area:OBJ. 1-1: Achieve the summer recreation opportunities identified in GOAL 1 through the route-by-route management decisions made through this Travel Plan. Any future proposals to change the uses specified should be done in consideration of the targeted recreation setting to be provided [see the “Recreation Opportunity Spectrum” (ROS) map for summer uses 10/2006 which is hereby incorporated by reference. OBJ. 2-1: Achieve the winter recreation opportunities identified in GOAL 2 through the marked and groomed route management decisions

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						made through this Travel Plan along with decisions made on the area available to snowmobiles. Any future proposals to change the uses specified should be done in consideration of the targeted recreation setting to be provided [see the “Recreation Opportunity Spectrum” (ROS) map for winter uses (10/2006)] which is hereby incorporated by reference. These additions to the preferred alternative incorporate the preferred alternative ROS allocations through map reference as future objectives of management.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		Allowing travel up to 300 feet off of a designated route, both roads and trails, is a very important opportunity for the public. The FS alternative does not adequately address this critical issue and we request that the preferred alternative allow this access and use in order to provide reasonable opportunities for the public.	Issues	All alternatives propose to allow travel up to 300' off of designated routes to access campsites. Alternative 7M does propose to disallow this 300' camping exception in several key riparian areas. Please refer to the Record of Decision once it is complete for a final listing of the areas where the 300' exception would be disallowed.
Brian Hawthorn	Blue Ribbon Coalition	1196		The document makes statements regarding various negative impacts of roads and vehicle use; i.e. trampled vegetation, compressed soils, increased sediment loading, disturbed wildlife etc., without disclosing what, if any, the significant impacts to the human environment for any of the alternatives are.	Issues	Please see Chapter 3: Issue 16 Recreation, and Issue 9 Social and Economic Effects for discussions relative to effect to the "human environment".
Brian Hawthorn	Blue Ribbon Coalition	1196		All routes open to motorcycles and ATVs are open to hiking and stock use, but the miles of trail open to hiking and stock use apparently do not reflect the mileage they share with motorized use. This skews the picture dramatically, and hides the fact that hikers and stock users have over three times the amount of opportunity that motorized users have, and more than double the mileage available to mountain bikes. Trails open to motorized and mechanized use are truly used by everyone, and should be counted as such.	Issues	Actually your statement is not correct - all trails that are open for motorized recreation are also "counted" as open to hiking and stock - though hiking and stock use may not be shown as "emphasized" on all of these routes. Over 2000 miles of trail are shown as available for hiking or stock use, including all motorized trails.
James H. Brown		1209		The cumulative effect (closures to motorized use) of travel plan in Region 1 over the past 10-15 years should be a major factor in the decision making process and should be examined and addressed. The displacement of wildlife is a concern, but the displacement of motorized recreation has been totally ignored.	Issues	Please see Chapter 3: Issue 16 Recreation Effects for a discussion of the potential cumulative impacts of different alternatives, and the likely effect on recreation opportunities of decisions made on adjacent public land.
James H. Brown		1209		WSA use was established in District Court in Judy Malloy's decision. Specific to the decision, the Rock	Issues	We do not question that snowmobile use was an established recreation activity in the WSA at the time of

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Creek and Hyalite WSAs have had a history of snowmobiling since 1968. The closure of the WSAs appears to be another instance of bias in the Alternatives. We question why this Court decision appears to have been ignored in the planning documents.		designation (1977). Alternatives 1-5 and 7M all consider snowmobile use in the WSA. Judge Molloy's ruling was appealed to higher courts, and then remanded back to his court. There is currently no final ruling the case of Montana Wilderness Association vs. the United States which would guide this travel plan proposal. Our direction is to ensure that the selected alternative is in keeping with the legal mandates given in the Montana Wilderness Study Act, Alternative 7M meets that mandate.
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness Society	1882		Furthermore, the agency must explain the data they have collected and analyses they have performed that demonstrates no significant environmental impact from OHV activities on the trails it proposed to leave open to motorized use.	Issues	Chapter 3 - Effects analysis includes detailed discussions of the potential effects of all recreation activities considered on a variety of resources, including OHV use on trails. Please review these sections.
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness Society	1882		Perhaps the most fundamental problem, however, is that ROS heavily weighs the current inventory of roads, trails, and recreational uses. To be sure, such methodology practically precludes the ROS from establishing appropriate recreational areas based on land and Resource Management Plans.	Issues	ROS methodology can be used both as an inventory tool, and as a planning tool to describe desired future conditions, as it was in the development of the Benchmark. Please see Chapter 3: Issue 16 Recreation for a thorough discussion of both applications of ROS and how it was applied to the DEIS and FEIS.
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness Society	1882		To help the FS realize the usefulness of the ROS Protocol, it will be essential to appropriately define the capacity of the land and its resources, the desired future condition of the forest, and the appropriateness of designing a recreational plan to meet demand for various types of recreation.	Issues	The ROS tool is meant in it's purest form to be a largely recreation driven planning tool - prescribing different settings as desired future conditions tempered by all of the factors you describe. Once a desired future condition is articulated in ROS terms, it is most often then modified to meet other resource objectives not necessarily considered in a focused recreation planning exercise.
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness Society	1882		While a new procedure is in place to more accurately record the number and type of visits to the GNF, additional future samples will have to be conducted in order to construct probably growth modes. Until that time, visitor and use statistics can be inferred from the existing National Visitor use Monitoring Results as well as related demographic statistics.	Issues	The National Visitor Use Monitoring protocol is designed to be repeated every 5 years. We realize the potential shortfall of the "snap shot" of data available from our 2003 sample, and did not rely on this information alone to describe existing condition or trend, but rather drew on a variety of sources to provided a rounded look at recreation trends. Please refer to Chapter 3: Issue 16 Recreation for a comprehensive look at visitor use data and trends. Future travel management analysis will have the benefit of several sample cycles specific to the Gallatin National Forest providing specific local trend information.
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness	1882		We must pay attention to demographic changes beyond the local and regional level. We must be	Issues	We agree and weighed demographic trend information carefully when designing the preferred alternative 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Society			aware of growth patterns through the country, paying attention not only to residency, but also to where people travel and recreate.		
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness Society	1882		Demographic trends suggest that planning for the future of the forest will require careful analysis of the human landscape 20 years from now, including the potential for unprecedented regional growth and increasing demand for the types of recreational opportunities available in and around the GNF. It is critical that the agency make its final decision with these trends in mind - we must plan for anticipated use, not current use.	Issues	We agree and weighed demographic trend information carefully when designing the preferred alternative 7M.
Ken Salo	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1916		We are very concerned about the proposed forest plan because by its proposed actions it will give higher priority to non-motorized recreationists and a lower priority to motorized recreationists. We request that an equal recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS) be provided for motorized recreationists in order to correct this partiality.	Issues	We do not agree that providing "equal" recreation opportunities will necessarily lead to the best travel plan. Instead we believe providing a broad mix of opportunities that the resource is capable of supporting and which responds to social issues should be the desired future condition. This may not be an "equal" mix of opportunities in some locations. Please see the Record of Decision (once it is completed) for more discussion on decision criteria and rationale for the final alternative.
Ken Salo	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1916		The proposed travel plan does not adequately address the cumulative effect on the public of the proposed motorized access and motorized recreational closures, combined with all other motorized access and motorized recreation closures in the state. We request that a fair and reasonable assessment of the cumulative effects of all motorized closures be provided in the DEIS and that the GNF Travel Plan adequately mitigate the significant cumulative effect of all closures on motorized recreationists.	Issues	Please see Chapter 3: Issue 16 Recreation Effects for a discussion of the potential cumulative impacts of different alternatives, and the likely effect to recreation opportunities of decisions made on adjacent public land.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	Seasonal restrictions on motorized use need to be adopted forest-wide. Winter restrictions should start about a month earlier than December to protect natural resources and ski opportunities earlier in the winter, especially for ATV abuse.	Issues	Many of the routes open to motorized use in the preferred alternative would have seasonal restrictions in the spring and fall. Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives - 7M for a list of the proposed seasonal restrictions and rationale. See the specific route tables for each travel planning area for a route by route description of proposed seasonal restrictions. In general - motorized use on trails would be permissible after 5/15, 6/15 or 7/15 depending on the location of the route and facility concerns, and would generally be

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						closed to motorized use on 9/15/ 10/15 or 12/1 depending on recreation objectives, or wildlife mitigation needs.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	How will improvements, such as plowing in Hyalite Canyon Road, reconstructing the trails in Bear Canyon for motorized traffic, new trailhead and motorized area boundary signs, new maps, and increased law enforcement, for next 15-20 years be paid for? Without adequate funding, the travel Plan will able to be partially implemented which may lead to worsening of current resource degradation problems. It may be more realistic to abandon some of the more costly plans which for the most part are proposed to accommodate motorized users.	Issues	Chapter 3: Issue 11 - Transportation System Implementability reviews an estimated cost of implementation for each alternative. All action alternatives are projected to be implementable within 5-10 years of the decision with current appropriated funding. Partnership dollars, grants and volunteer work will also play a significant role in implementing portions of the selected alternative. Once a decision is made, work projects will be prioritized and scheduled over several years, with an immediate focus on user products like maps, signs, and education programs as well as trail construction/reconstruction projects necessary to implement the decision.
Carl Krob		187	Bozeman	Confining different user group to certain smaller area is only going to create more problems and safety issues.	Issues	We think that concentrating motorized use will be beneficial in a number of ways, both to the trails as well as other resources. We propose to shift some OHV use to old roads because roads are built to absorb more use. Trails that will be open to OHV use will be maintained to standard for those uses. Concentrating use also allows us to concentrate our dollars and resources on specific routes. Concentrating use can be helpful to wildlife - it expands core habitat and allows more places where wildlife can disperse, and finally concentrating use allows us to provide separate areas dedicated to non-motorized recreation, minimizing conflicts.
Dan Franks		192	Salt Lake City, UT	I understand that the Forest Service is considering closing most trails in the Gallatin National Forest to horses prior to June 15. I would like to state my opposition to this proposal. To my mind these trails have existed with few if any problems for many years. Perhaps whatever the Forest Service's perceived issues with these trails are could be delta with better by education the public and trail improvements.	Issues	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Tim Shinabarger		272	Billings	Based on my experience talking to hundreds of users in the field, their greatest concern is just having the downfall cleared each year. I know that this doesn't address the problem of erosion, but it must be remembered that trails are as natural as the trees growing along side them. There have been	Issues	Thank you for your thoughts. Trail clearing and maintenance have been and will continue to be priorities for us as we move forward with this proposal.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				game trail for thousands of years. I can take you to game trails today on the Gallatin that are foot deep and have never seen the hoof of a horse. There is far more erosion from a single fire that year than soft trail use. A trail is a narrow ribbon through vast beautiful country. If is deteriorates from time to time, so be it.		
Donald Lovely		758	Helena	A couple of editing comments on specifics of Preferred Alternative: Regarding the web site and information referenced in Volume 2, Chapter 3-Uses: ATVs2, I could not determine how this information was collected…it just seemed that hunting activities are under-represented throughout all documents including the expanded social economic analysis. I was curious about which days were selected for the statistics...was the opening week of big game hunting season included in the samples if so, how was that info included in the statistical sample? I therefore could not reach a conclusion as to the validity of the presented data.	Issues	Chapter 3: Issue 16 Recreation details recreation use data collected from the Gallatin NF during a 1 year sample using a national protocol based on statistically sound sample designs. Exiting visitors were interviewed on over 200 randomly selected days including many days during Montana's hunting seasons. This data is display on page 3-423. Sample methods were designed and validated by social researchers. Please see the website: www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/ for a detailed accounting of the sample design. Additionally hunting data projected for the Rocky Mountains based on data gathered for an ongoing recreation study - The National Survey on Recreation and the Environment. Please see the reference to Cordell, 2004 in the references section for more information on this study.
James Brown		894	Livingston	Alt 1 ignores the 2001 3-State OHV EIS decision of the ban on cross country travel as an existing condition. The concept of areas closed is not consistent w/ FS regulations as established by appeals to the Stanislaus NF Travel Mgt Plan. "Closed unless posted open" is not consistent w/ the 3-State OHV decision. Specific to Judge Molloy's 5/20/2001 decision the Rock Creek and Hyalite WSAs have had a history of snowmobiling since 1968. We question why this decision appears to have been ignored in the planning documents.	Laws and Regulations	Alternatives 2-7M are all consistent with the Montana Dakota OHV decision of 2001 and the recent National OHV direction provided in a final rule amending travel planning policy in 2005. Alternative 1 would reverse the Montana OHV decision in a sense, in that it would simply continue to provide the opportunities as described on the Gallatin NF 1999 travel map. We do not question that snowmobile use was an established recreation activity in the WSA at the time of designation (1977). Alternatives 1-5 and 7M all consider snowmobile use in the WSA. Judge Molloy's ruling was appealed to higher courts, and then remanded back to his court. There is currently no final ruling the case of Montana Wilderness Association vs. the United States which would guide this travel plan proposal. Our direction is to ensure that the selected alternative is in keeping with the legal mandates given in the Montana Wilderness Study Act, Alternative 7M meets that mandate.
Ramona Ehnes		918	Great Falls	Wilderness Study Areas are to be maintained at the levels they were in 1977. Snowmobiling was allowed in the WSAs in 1977 and use prior to 1970 is easily	Laws and Regulations	We do not question that snowmobile use was an established recreation activity in the WSA at the time of designation (1977). Alternatives 1-5 and 7M all consider

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				documented. Why a court case of this importance would be ignored during the planning process is puzzlement. "Closed unless posted open" is another questionable item in the planning process. This concept of area closure is not consistent w/ Forest Service regulations as established by appeals to the Stanislaus NF Travel Mgt Plan.		snowmobile use in the WSA. Judge Molloy's ruling was appealed to higher courts, and then remanded back to his court. There is currently no final ruling the case of Montana Wilderness Association vs. the United States which would guide this travel plan proposal. Our direction is to ensure that the selected alternative is in keeping with the legal mandates given in the Montana Wilderness Study Act, Alternative 7M meets that mandate. Alternatives 2-7M are all consistent with the Montana Dakota OHV decision of 2001 and the recent National OHV direction provided in a final rule amending travel planning policy in 2005, which mandates that all wheeled motor vehicle travel be on designated routes .
Dale Tischmak		989	Fort Collins CO	There is a recurring theme I see in FS documents regarding the so-called "roadless" areas. There seems to be a very hard push to turn these areas into defacto wilderness. This is not in accordance w/ the FS's own guidelines. It seems clear to me that there is no national requirement or mandate to ban motorized trails from "roadless" areas.	Laws and Regulations	There is currently no Agency policy to manage inventoried roadless as defacto wilderness, motorized recreation is permissible in roadless areas unless restricted for some other reason than simply the fact that the area is roadless. The preferred Alternative 7M would manage many miles of open motorized routes in roadless - see Chapter 3: Issue 18 Roadless Areas for a complete discussion each alternative in roadless.
Steve Didier	Back Country Horsemen of America	475	Graham, WA	Back Country Horsemen of Montana and America are opposed to any blanket type (area or seasonal) closures/restrictions to stock use. Note, however, both groups would support other type restriction/actions by most other means than blanket closure/restriction, to the extent that they are clearly necessary to meet the intent of Congress and are determined through site specific NEPA analysis providing public involvement, a range of alternatives, and associated effects analysis.	Laws and Regulations	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
				Lava Lake Trail: how do you access Table Mtn from Cascade Creek- 2 trails could be a option.	Lee Metcalf - Spanish Peaks	Under the preferred alternative 7M, the Lava Lake trail would be closed to stock from December 2 - September 15. The remainder of the year Table Mountain would be accessible from the Lava Lake Trail. During times of the year when the Lava Lake trail is proposed to be closed to stock, access with stock to Table Mountain would be from the Deer Creek Trail.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	lava Lake Trail # 11. Alternative 7 appropriately proposes to exclude stock for the popular trail. It is short, rough, narrow, and heavily used by hikers. When people and stock meet it is very difficult to find places to get off the trail to allow horses to get by.	Lee Metcalf - Spanish Peaks	Under the preferred alternative 7M, the Lava Lake trail would be closed to stock from December 2 - September 15. This recognizes proposal is designed to mitigate user conflict and address safety concerns relative to stock use and heavy hiking traffic during the peak hiking

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						season. The remainder of the year (from Sept. 15 - Dec. 1) stock would be allowed on the trail, with no overnight camping at Lava Lake.
Robert Bayley	Camp Cedar Design	882	Ennis	Many of the trails in the Lionhead area are closed to motorized, which is commendable. Some trails in the recommended wilderness which penetrate the high fragile alpine core are open to bicycles and snowmobiles. These should be maintained as machine and motor free to be consistent w/ wilderness values.	Lionhead	Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative proposes to manage the trails in the Lionhead area as closed to motorized use, and closed to snowmobiles throughout all but a small portion of the area (please see the Alternative 7M maps). Please see the Record of Decision and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities in the Lionhead RW. During the DEIS we failed to consider an alternative which would prohibit mountain bikes, but have included that in Alternative 6 in the FEIS. Mountain bikes are not proposed to be restricted in Alternative 7M, because the public was not given an opportunity to comment on this in the DEIS. Prohibiting mountain bikes in Lionhead may be considered in the future. Please see the Record of Decision once it is complete for more discussion on this topic.
Charlie Crangle		902	Bozeman	I like the fact that both Lionhead & Porcupine-Buffalo Horn study areas are protected from ORV use. Wilderness values need to be respected in a WSA.	Lionhead	Thank you for your comment.
Michael Lebwohl		943	Gallatin Gateway	The FS has placed the Lionhead area on its recommended wilderness list. The travel plan should put in place wilderness attributes so that the area will qualify for wilderness designation. That means the area should be managed as motor free.	Lionhead	Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative proposes to manage the trails in the Lionhead RW area as closed to motorized use, and closed to snowmobiles throughout all but a small portion of the area (please see the Alternative 7M maps). Please see the Record of Decision and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities in the Lionhead RW.
Gretchen Rupp		969	Bozeman	Prohibit motorized travel in the Lionhead WSA. The FS has nominated this area for wilderness and it makes no sense to encourage motorized use there.	Lionhead	Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative proposes to manage the trails in the Lionhead RW area as closed to motorized use, and closed to snowmobiles throughout all but a small portion of the area (please see the Alternative 7M maps). Please see the Record of Decision and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities in the Lionhead RW. .
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	In the Lionshead Recommended Wilderness the Forest Service took 3 years, 1995, 1996 and 1997 to reconstruct the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail and Coffin Lake Trail with a backhoe. These trails where reconstructed after the area designated	Lionhead	Alternative 7M proposes to manage all the trails within the Lionhead recommended wilderness as closed to motorized vehicles. This proposal is in keeping with Regional guidance for travel management which provides direction to manage recreation use in

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				a Recommended Wilderness Area in 1987. The DEIS on pg 3-446 states, "Motorcycle traffic on these routes have been historically been light." If creating trail with a backhoe does not impair Wilderness Designateability, certainly "light" motorcycle use does not either. Closing motorcycle trails in the Lionshead Recommended Wilderness Area, when the Forest Service constructed a majority of the trails with a backhoe after the Recommended Wilderness Area designation, is discrimination, and hypocritical.		recommended wilderness to provide for non-motorized recreation opportunities. As you noted, the Coffin Lake trail was reconstructed with a small trail grader in the 1990s, when the trail was open to motor vehicle travel. The trail reconstruction project was designed to bring the trail up to "pack and saddle" standards, which is the primary management objective for this route. The target tread width and trail standards post re-construction is in keeping with trail guidelines for wilderness trails. The project would not jeopardize future management of this area as wilderness. While light travel of motorcycles is not likely to significantly negatively affect most physical parameters of a wilderness study area, motorized recreation does have a negative effect on other user's opportunities for solitude, and sense of primitive recreation experience, which is not in keeping with wilderness philosophy. The Lionhead area also provides important grizzly bear and bighorn sheep habitat and wildlife linkages to the Madison Range. Motorized recreation would have a negative effect on these important resources (see the wildlife effects analysis in Chapter 3). Please refer to the record of decision once it is complete for more discussion on rationale, and to the Wilderness/Recommended Wilderness Issue in Chapter 3 of the FEIS for more discussion on the effects of motorized recreation on wilderness character.
Loren Blanksma		36		Lionhead should remain open because there are numerous other trails in this area closed to motorized use.	Lionhead	By in large - the preferred alternative would manage most of the "other trails in the area" as open to summer and winter motorized recreation. Most of the trail system within the South Plateau and Hebgen Basin travel planning areas adjacent to Lionhead would be open to motorized uses (please see the summer motorized map for Alternative 7M the preferred alternative). Much of the trail system on the adjacent Targhee NF is open to motorized uses.
Catherine Weeden		1604		In summer, all Lionhead trails should be non-motorized. This would include the portion of the Continental Divide Scenic Trail. As an area recommended for Wilderness by the GNF, management plans should be to manage the LRW as Wilderness.	Lionhead	Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative proposes to manage the trails in the Lionhead RW area as closed to motorized use, and closed to snowmobiles throughout all but a small portion of the area (please see the Alternative 7M maps). Please see the Record of Decision and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities in the Lionhead RW. Only Congress can designate areas as

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						wilderness, the preferred alternative 7M proposes to manage recreation opportunities to preserve wilderness character and to ensure future designation potential is not compromised.
Catherine Weeden		1604		All portions of the CDST should be non-motorized. As a high elevation trail; as one of the country's "through trails" as a trail that will be part of our American heritage, we need to protect this trail for the experience it provides - now and into the next 15 years.	Lionhead	Alternative 7M proposes to construct new trail from Reas Pass north to the CDNST junction with Watkins Creek which would be managed as a non-motorized route. This trail would parallel (but be separated from) the existing stretches of the CDNST which are currently open to (an proposed to continue to be open to) motorized use in the summer. This proposal would provide a non-motorized recreation experience along the CDNST.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The recommended wilderness areas in the Lionead and Republic TPAs should be closed to motorized and mechanized use. Allowing continued motorized and mechanized use in the recommended wilderness is not consistent with the goals of protecting wilderness values as defined by the Wilderness Act.	Lionhead	Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative proposes to manage the trails in the Lionhead RW area as closed to motorized use, and closed to snowmobiles throughout all but a small portion of the area (please see the Alternative 7M maps). Please see the Record of Decision and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities in the Lionhead RW. .
Laura Oliver		480	Bozeman	Lionhead: This region of the Gallatin, which the Forest Service recommends for wilderness designation, should be protected from motorized use. The Lionhead is an important wildlife corridor between Yellowstone Park, the Continental Divide and wilderness areas within the Madison Range. Snowmobiling and other motorized uses do not belong here.	Lionhead	Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative proposes to manage the trails in the Lionhead RW area as closed to motorized use, and closed to snowmobiles throughout all but a small portion of the area (please see the Alternative 7M maps). Please see the Record of Decision and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities in the Lionhead RW. .
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		We strongly disagree with the provision in the preferred alternative for the Lionhead that establishes a snowmobile area within the recommended wilderness. There are several problems with this proposal for an open snowmobile area. First, it is unambiguously at odds with the Forest Services own, clearly stated logic and rationale. Rethinking the manageability of the Lionhead Recommended Wilderness area boundary as defined in the existing Forest Plan is not a travel plan decision; it is a Forest Plan decision, and should be addressed in the upcoming forest plan revision.	Lionhead	Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative proposes to manage the trails in the Lionhead RW area as closed to motorized use, and closed to snowmobiles throughout all but a small portion of the area (please see the Alternative 7M maps). Please see the Record of Decision and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities in the Lionhead RW. .
Cledith E. an dDinah P. Oakley		559	Cameron	Allow no motorized travel west of the junction of Trail #217 and West Fork Denny's Creek road #1735 - The junction of #217 and #1735 is the most logical	Lionhead	Alternative 6 considered the configuration you suggest. In Alternative 7M (the preferred alternative) Trail #217 is proposed to be open to ATV's and motorcycles to the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				point at which to stop motorized traffic to prevent drivers from intruding into the non-motorized trails or trail segments. We are especially concerned over the potential of fragmentation disturbance of the Grizzly Recovery Area, noise, public safety, riparian areas, recreation, sensitive wildlife, enforcement, and the potential for degradation of the wilderness character.		junction with trail #114 - providing a loop opportunity for OHV's outside of the Lionhead recommended wilderness. This configuration would provide secure wildlife habitat through the important riparian zone in Watkins Creek west through the entire Lionhead Recommended Wilderness.
Peggy A. Lynn		342		The Lionhead trail #217 should be non-motorized, the snowmachine closure in the Lionhead area including Watkins Creek Trail #215 - close to snowmobiles a clearly definable, enforceable area around the Continental Divide Trail on the east (south) of Targhee Pass and the Continental Bowl area on the west (north) of Targhee Pass.	Lionhead	Alternative 6 considered the configuration you suggest. In Alternative 7M (the preferred alternative) Trail #217 is proposed to be open to ATV's and motorcycles to the junction with trail #114 - providing a loop opportunity for OHV's outside of the Lionhead recommended wilderness. This configuration would provide secure wildlife habitat through the important riparian zone in Watkins Creek west through the entire Lionhead Recommended Wilderness. The area would be closed to snowmobiles throughout all but a small portion of the area (please see the Alternative 7M maps). The snowmobile boundary proposed in Alternative 7M was designed to move the current closure location to a more definable (ridge) location, to improve enforceability. Please see the Record of Decision and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities in the Lionhead RW.
Alex Phillips		1483a		I find it very odd that the ID team is willing to go against the agreement of all of Region One and continue to allow snowmobile driving in the recommended wilderness boundary just because it is popular with snowmobilers. They have so much other area down there; giving them a few more quarter sections is not worth the precedence this would cause. If the area inside the recommended wilderness boundary is really not suitable for wilderness designation lets have that public discussion during Forest Planning. Continuing to allow snowmobiles into recommended wilderness now would be in effect making a def facto decision to remove it from wilderness consideration.	Lionhead	The snowmobile boundary proposed in Alternative 7M was designed to move the current closure location to a more definable (ridge) location, to improve enforceability. This proposal was designed to provide a balance between Regional guidance relative managing recommended wilderness and pragmatic on-the-ground management issues. The decision would not make any changes to the current Forest Plan direction as recommended wilderness. Current forest plan direction specifically allows motorized uses that are established to continue until such time as the area is designated wilderness. Please see the Record of Decision and Detailed Description of the Decision for the final configuration of recreation opportunities in the Lionhead RW.
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	When this is all finalized, don't even think about printing different maps for different users. All activities allowed must all be shown on one map, as	Maps	Part of the map products that will be provided after the travel plan decision are mandated under the new National OHV Rule - under 36 CFR 212.56 This new

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the current travel plan does. Different maps would give different users un-realistic expectations and everyone will be frustrated with everyone else because "they" are infringing on 'my" turf. Also a map for motorized users that does not show all roads and trails is only half a map and makes it hard to determine where you are. A motorized user may want to hike on one of the trails. That would entail carrying 2 maps. No thanks.		regulation dictates that annually a Motor Vehicle Use Map be published that shows the open motorized routes and any seasonal restrictions. This map becomes the legal enforcement tool for the travel plan decision as it relates to summer motorized use. National direction has been provided that dictates what will be displayed on this map. It will not display all recreation opportunities. This map will be a simple product that is provided free to the public. The Forest is however exploring creating a new Forest Visitor Map which will display all recreation opportunities on 1 map, including non-motorized routes and snowmobile restriction, and hopes to provide this product concurrently with implementation of the final decision. Additionally within a year or so we will have an electronic on-line map product available which will provide detailed information on route management.
Linda Ellison		1070		I would encourage you to make Travel Plan maps more readily available . Visitor Maps need to go away totally. All maps should be the same format. The development of individual guides should be discouraged. They are not practical if we intend to allow particular uses on some trails without emphasizing that use as a mitigation tool. One-size fits all visitor guides should point out the various points of interest, but emphasize their availability to a broad spectrum of visitors.	Maps	Part of the map products that will be provided after the travel plan decision are mandated under the new National OHV Rule - under 36 CFR 212.56 This new regulation dictates that annually a Motor Vehicle Use Map be published that shows the open motorized routes and any seasonal restrictions. This map becomes the legal enforcement tool for the travel plan decision as it relates to summer motorized use. National direction has been provided that dictates what will be displayed on this map. It will not display all recreation opportunities. This map will be a simple product that is provided free to the public. The Forest is however exploring creating a new Forest Visitor Map which will display all recreation opportunities on 1 map, including non-motorized routes and snowmobile restriction, and hopes to provide this product concurrently with implementation of the final decision. Additionally within a year or so we will have an electronic on-line map product available which will provide detailed information on route management, that the public will have many options for highlighting areas of interest and creating their own maps.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We recommend that the visitor map be reconfigured so that the WSA is not split, requiring two maps to show the WSA in its entirety. The current visitor map also duplicates some areas, making map reading very confusing.	Maps	Thank you for this suggestion. Dividing the forest into logical compartments on a visitor map is always challenging - we attempt to minimize the number of maps necessary, while covering logical land features on one map. The Forest is considering switching to a 1 inch = 1 mile map base for the next visitor map, which

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						will necessitate different divisions than have been used historically - but have not yet been determined.
Alex Phillips		1483a		I suggest publishing one map that shows the Crazies and the Bridgers and another map that shows the rest of the forest. This will also eliminate the large sections of private land while still showing all of the access roads.	Maps	Thank you for this suggestion. Dividing the forest into logical compartments on a visitor map is always challenging - we attempt to minimize the number of maps necessary, while covering logical land features on one map. The Forest is considering switching to a 1 inch = 1 mile map base for the next visitor map, which will necessitate different divisions than have been used historically - but have not yet been determined.
Virginia A. Milne and David B. Milne		676	Bozeman	Printed forest maps should indicate the designated recreational uses of each trail to eliminate confusion about what uses are allowed and dissension between different kinds of trail users. Signs are useful but sometimes are removed or defaced.	Maps	Part of the map products that will be provided after the travel plan decision are mandated under the new National OHV Rule - under 36 CFR 212.56 This new regulation dictates that annually a Motor Vehicle Use Map be published that shows the open motorized routes and any seasonal restrictions. This map becomes the legal enforcement tool for the travel plan decision as it relates to summer motorized use. National direction has been provided that dictates what will be displayed on this map. It will not display all recreation opportunities. This map will be a simple product that is provided free to the public. The Forest is however exploring creating a new Forest Visitor Map which will display all recreation opportunities on 1 map, including non-motorized routes and snowmobile restriction, and hopes to provide this product concurrently with implementation of the final decision. Additionally within a year or so we will have an electronic on-line map product available which will provide detailed information on route management, that the public will have many options for highlighting areas of interest and creating their own maps.
Will Robertson		304		The trail usage tables note that Trails 33 and 223 are open to mountain bikes, but the non-motorized map shows them closed to bikes.	Maps	Thanks for noting this error. It has been corrected in the FEIS.
R.L. Stucker		342A	Livingston	Suggestion for travel use plan: concerning areas that are overused ask that people plan other destinations, and explain to people that suggestion is due to overuse. Consider applying the suggestion to Thompson Lake (Mill Creek Fork).	Mill Creek	Thank you for your suggestion. Visitor education, and information about what sort of recreation setting to expect will be in important part of implementing the new travel plan.
Edie Mellgren		656		The rationale for funneling ATV traffic through an old, peaceful, and historically important community is quite questionable. Imposing such traffic upon a highly popular historic resort area raises concerns.	Mill Creek	The Emigrant Gulch road where it passes through the town of Emigrant/Old Chico is a public road, open to licensed street legal motorized vehicles, over which the Forest Service has no jurisdiction. In Alternative 7M the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Policing ATVs would be a burdensome problem for Park County law officers.		upper portion of this drainage, which is a Forest Road, is proposed to be managed as open to both OHVs and passenger car vehicles (4x4 high clearance vehicles).
Richard Kinkie		1681		Wallace Pass Trail (#623) and the other trails in the Mill Creek - Six Mile Creek area. While there are years when these trails will be closed due to snow, outfitters and the public should be allowed to access these trails at an earlier date. Early use by these groups of people is important as they usually keep the trails cut out. I suggest that year round use be allowed on these trails.	Mill Creek	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
EJ. Dodge		1899	Livingston	Mill Creek area south of Livingston, Trails 51, 54, 282, 279 are just some that are affected by the suggested closure of horse use in the spring. One reason given was to protect soft trails. I don't think any of these trails would ever be very soft because of all the rock in this area. Anyone doing spring bear hunting would be greatly affected if they could not use horses.	Mill Creek	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II - the description of alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Steve Moore		505	Bozeman	Currently, nearly 70 percent of the GNF trailheads close to Bozeman allow motorized usage. This seems a disproportionate share given that motorized users represent only about 10 percent of forest users.	Miscellaneous	It is correct that currently about 70% of the trail opportunities within a 30 mile drive of Bozeman are open to motorized use. The travel plan team recognized this distribution of opportunity issue, and designed several alternatives which would provide additional front country non-motorized opportunities close to communities. Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative would shift the existing number of non-motorized opportunities within 30 miles of Bozeman from about 30% today to a configuration that would provide about 57% of the trails for non-motorized recreation opportunities in the summer. Additionally the decision will consider a "time share" component to several other popular routes in the Bridgers and Northern Gallatin Range, where routes that are proposed to be open for motorized use, would be managed as non-motorized during certain days of the week or weeks of the month during the summer season. See the Record of Decision for the final description of the "time share" proposal.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		Monitoring the impacts of OHV use has clearly been ineffective. Executive order 11644 section 3(a) requires OHV areas and trails to be located in a matter that: minimizes damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, or other resources; minimizes	Monitoring	We recognize that historic monitoring of OHV effects has been somewhat sporadic, and lacking in defined protocol. However, monitoring has been ongoing, and definitely contributed to the knowledge of issues and concerns that drove alternative development in the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats; minimizes user conflicts between OHV use and all other recreational uses. The Forest Service must clearly address the specific results and analysis of past monitoring of OHV impacts, and explain in detail how this data has informed their current plan revision. The agency must also clearly explained the data they have collected and analyzed that resulted in the decision to abolish certain forest plan standards, such as the Habitat Effectiveness Index.		Travel Plan analysis. Monitoring provided valuable information about user conflicts, soil and water concerns, etc. and will continue to do so in the future. The National OHV decision which came out in 2005 redefined 36 CFR 295 relative to OHV monitoring. Please see current 36 CFR 212.57 for exact language on new monitoring requirements. In essence the CFR states that the responsible agency official will monitor the effects of motor vehicle use on designated roads and trails as appropriate and feasible. The FEIS includes an outline of monitoring protocols which will be employed in the future. A rigorous system for monitoring the conditions of trails has been developed in recent years (called TRACS) and will be used for monitoring trail condition on all routes - including those open to OHV's in the future. The purpose of amending the Forest Plan to remove various existing standards (such as HEI) can be found in Chapter 1 and Appendix A of the FEIS. There is also a discussion of the proposed amendments under Issue 8, in Chapter 3 of the FEIS.
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	1302		An effective OHV monitoring program should include three major components: monitoring of levels and types of OHV use; monitoring of routes open to OHV use and the conditions of these routes; monitoring of the impacts of OHV use to wildlife, water quality comment and nonmotorized use.	Monitoring	Please see Volume 1, Appendix B for a description of OHV monitoring programs linked to the travel plan. The FEIS includes an outline of monitoring protocols which will be employed in the future. A rigorous system for monitoring the conditions of trails has been developed in recent years (called TRACS) and will be used for monitoring trail condition on all routes - including those open to OHV's in the future. Use monitoring will be accomplished through the National Visitor Use Monitoring protocol - a statistically sound sample method that monitors visitor use every 5 years. For more information on this protocol please see: www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum/
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		The FS should prepare a management plan for the WSA, preferably based on LAC methodology, and commit resources to a special monitoring program in support of the plan. Regular WSA monitoring should be included in the implementation plan and budget.	Monitoring	Creating a "management plan for the WSA" is outside of the scope of this decision. Management direction for lands within the HPBH WSA are articulated in our current Forest Plan. The Forest is planning to develop a more rigorous monitoring protocol for the WSA in the future - to be in keeping with direction in the Forest Plan, and the direction found in Forest Service Manual Interim Directive id_2300-2005-1.
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness	1882		The travel plan's monitoring component should include specific details as to how it will be funded,	Monitoring	The National OHV decision which came out in 2005 redefined 36 CFR 295 relative to OHV monitoring.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Society			implemented, and conducted in a timely, efficient manner. Moreover, an effective OHV monitoring program should include three major components: Monitoring of levels and types of OHV use; Monitoring of routes open to OHV use and the conditions of these routes; Monitoring of the impacts of OHV use to wildlife, water quality, and non-motorized use. If OHV use cannot be adequately monitored and enforced in a management area, then closures should be implemented.		Please see current 36 CFR 212.57 for exact language on new monitoring requirements. In essence the CFR states that the responsible agency official will monitor the effects of motor vehicle use on designated roads and trails as appropriate and feasible. The FEIS includes an outline of monitoring protocols which will be employed in the future. A rigorous system for monitoring the conditions of trails has been developed in recent years (called TRACS) and will be used for monitoring trail condition on all routes - including those open to OHV's in the future. Please see Volume 1, Appendix B for a description of OHV monitoring programs linked to the travel plan. The FEIS includes an outline of monitoring protocols which will be employed in the future. Use monitoring will be accomplished through the National Visitor Use Monitoring protocol - a statistically sound sample method that monitors visitor use every 5 years. For more information on this protocol please see: www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum/ The specifics of monitoring (e.g. funding, scope, etc.) are not decisions made in the travel plan, but we've provided the outline of proposed monitoring protocols for public review none-the-less.
Loren Blanksma		36		Gardiner, Mill Creek and Main Boulder, and East Boulder all have loop motorcycle trail opportunities currently (Bear Creek #364, Little Palmer #67, Wicked Ridge #78, Grouse Creek #114, Green Mt. #94, Graham Creek #117) which are planned to be eliminated. If these trails are eliminated there would no longer remain any motorized opportunities in these small areas that are bordered by the vast non-motorized AB Wilderness.	Motorcycles	Alternative 7M, the preferred alternative proposes to provide motorcycle opportunities in all 3 of these areas, though not necessarily the specific routes you note in your comment. Please see the Alternative 7M summer motorized map.
John Perdaems		76		I also wonder about your calculated "miles for motorized use". I do not own a motorcycle, but I notice that the Gallatin Crest is open for motorcycles. Is that even a safe place to ride? I doubt that should even be counted as "miles of open motorized use". Same goes for the spine of the Bridgers. Motorcycles up there?	Motorcycles	Motorcycles are capable of riding most trails that are suitable for foot or stock travel (which includes the Gallatin Crest). Alternative 7M proposes to allow motorcycles on the northern portion of the Crest Trail from July 15 - September 5. The Bridger Ridge trail is proposed in this alternative to be managed for foot travel and closed to motorcycles.
Linda Ellison		1070		Either motorcycles should be able to use "created" routes as well, or all user created routes should be closed and restored. One of the primary purposes of the 3-state agreement was to limit the proliferation of	Motorcycles	The Montana Dakota OHV decision of 2001 and the recent National OHV direction in 2005 only address the cross country travel of motor vehicles, not foot or stock travel. The mandates provided in the National OHV

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				"user created" trails. Is there a problem with user created trails or not? The language in the DEIS effectively says: "It's OK for horses to go off-trail (and cause damage) because now OHVs cannot." this is exceedingly discriminatory.		decision prescribe that all summer motorized vehicle travel be managed on designated routes - and that motorized travel on "user created routes" be either officially sanctioned by adding them to the trail system or curtailed. This is the authority which will be used to implement the Gallatin Travel Plan Decision. No widespread concerns were identified over off-route stock use, nor is there higher level Forest Service direction to restrict such use to designated routes. There are identified effects from stock in specific areas of the Gallatin Forest, but these can be adequately addressed through other means such as trail reconstruction, potential seasonal restrictions, administration of outfitter and guide permits, and public information and education.
Joe Polus		1487		Local motorcyclists clear GNF trails for the enjoyment of all users. Most of this clearing takes place anonymously and is not documented by the GNF. The value of this volunteer service has been greatly under acknowledged by the GNF.	Motorcycles	Volunteer work to supplement trail maintenance is an important component of the overall program, providing critical supplements to work we accomplish with appropriated dollars. If work is occurring anonymously - it would be difficult for us to acknowledge that effort!
Daryl Blanksma		1193		I don't believe that a single track travel riding opportunities in other area of the GNF that are presently open should be denied to motorcycle users. The rather light overall use and limited impact of motorcycle use does not warrant their closure in the Gallatin Canyon, Hagen, Crazy, And East Boulder areas.	Motorcycles	The Forest Service believes that motorized use is a legitimate use of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Donald Lovely		758	Helena	The September 15th closure of access deprives bird hunters and archers who use motorcycles for access during the major portion of their hunting seasons. I feel a plan-wide date of October 15 would be more reasonable.	Motorcycles	The Detailed Description of the Alternatives - Chapter II describes the different seasonal restrictions considered in the FEIS. Alternative 7M does propose to use both the September 15 and October 15 dates. Where the September 15th date is recommended, the rationale is to provide for fall wildlife habitat security, or provide a non-motorized recreation (hunting) opportunity in some areas. We received many comments from bird hunters and archers that they believed their hunting experience was being negatively affected by the presence of motor vehicles, and tried to provide areas of the forest for both motorized and non-motorized access during bird/archery season. See the Detailed Description of the Decision for a route by route listing of the proposed fall restriction

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						dates.
Joyce Conners		135	Bozeman	Travel restrictions to motorized bikes from Sept 15 to July 15, that is how it is written in the documents, on an annual basis is not acceptable. Then all the GNF has to say is high fire danger come July and the trails are closed year round.	Motorcycles	Seasonal restrictions on trails vary according to resource issues they are designed to mitigate. Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives Chapter II for a discussion of the rationale for various proposed restrictions. Fire restrictions rarely prohibit motorized recreationists from accessing the Forest - except during total closures, or for safety during an actual wildfire. Total closures of the Forest are extremely rare, having only occurred once in the last several decades.
Joyce Thompson		986	Belgrade	Motorized need loop opportunities such as Minnie Wapiti Trail # 203 and Cabin Creek Divide #206. We need trail systems close to town so people can recreate after work such as Bear Canyon/ Bear Lakes trail #53. Longer riding seasons should be allowed in the Deer Creek and East Boulder b/c the soils are sandy, rocky and the snow leaves early.	Motorized (General)	Alternative 7M strives to provide a mix of recreation opportunities close to populations centers, and would provide loop opportunities in Bear Canyon, Cabin Creek, Buck Ridge, etc. Alternative 7M would manage open motorcycle routes from May 15 - October 15. The spring open date is the earliest date proposed for opening motorized routes.
Janet Krob		64	Bozeman	The reality is that it is imperative that more areas be opened to multiple access to alleviate the growing recreational population not only in Gallatin Valley but all across Montana. More folks are moving here for the opportunities to recreation.	Motorized (General)	The proposed travel plan strives to provide a broad mix of recreation opportunities, including motorized and non-motorized uses to meet growing demand for many types of activities.
Doug and Linda Black		466	Gallatin Gateway	You are discriminating against a segment of the population who cannot easily walk or have a physical limitation which precludes their enjoyment of a mountain experience. Last year we took a special friend of ours on an ATV ride. He and his wife were enjoying a recreational opportunity that is not often afforded to him. As we followed the roads and trails we came to a metal gate positioned across the trail that denied access to an area that would have allowed him to look into the Hyalite drainage the Squaw Creek drainage. It would have been wonderful if he could have hopped off of his four wheeler and hiked the distance to the top, but our friend is paralyzed from the waist down and unless he is allowed to visit on an ATV he is not going to be able to share in the beauty of these areas.	Motorized (General)	Under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, no person with a disability can be denied participation in a Federal program that is available to all other people solely because of his or her disability. In conformance with section 504, all wheelchairs that meet the definition in 36 CFR 212.1 are welcome on all National Forest System Lands that are open to foot travel. These wheelchairs are specifically exempted from the definition of motor vehicle in 36 CFR 212.1, even if they are battery powered. However, there is no legal requirement to allow people with disabilities to use OHV's or other motor vehicles on roads or trails closed to motor vehicles because such an exemption would undercut the resource protection afforded by the closure and therefore could fundamentally alter the nature of the Forest Service's travel management program. Restrictions on motor vehicle use that are applied consistently to everyone are not discriminatory.
Greg, Michelle & Cole Baker		230	Bozeman	If you continued to allow access by snowmobile for cross country skiing, Ice, climbing, and general	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that motorized use is a legitimate and appropriate use of the national forests.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				riding, at least you would be upholding people right to access the land.		The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
R W Black	Black Ranch Inc	885	Hinsdale	The fastest growing segment of national forest use is OHV use. The main problem seems to be caused by overuse of trails; reducing the amount of available trails will certainly not help.	Motorized (General)	Scientifically peer reviewed research and literature would not support your contention that OHV use is the fastest growing segment of use on National Forests. Please see Chapter 3 - Issue 16: Recreation for a summary of recreation use and projected demand. Statistically valid recreation use samples taken on the Gallatin NF in 2003 indicate that OHV use currently comprises a small percentage of overall recreation use on the Forest. Again - please see Chapter 3 - Issue 16 Recreation Effects for a complete review of use information and trends. We believe there is adequate capacity for current and projected demand for motorized recreation activities with the route configuration proposed in Alternative 7M. Alternative 7M responds to many comments that by providing more separated motorized and non-motorized opportunities particularly in front country settings we will reduce user conflicts, not increase them.
Michael Boehm		886	Wilsall	Every where I go I see damage caused by the increasing popular motorized users. I am on record supporting rules that restrict motorized access.	Motorized (General)	Thank you for your comment. The proposed travel plan strives to provide a broad mix of recreation opportunities, including motorized and non-motorized uses to meet growing demand for many types of activities. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
David Fisher		912	Billings	The number 1 sport growing is motorized and with more restrictions concentrating all uses and creating potential conflict w/ users.	Motorized (General)	Scientifically peer reviewed research and literature would not support your contention that OHV use is the fastest growing segment of use on National Forests. Please see Chapter 3 - Issue 16: Recreation for a summary of recreation use and projected demand. Statistically valid recreation use samples taken on the Gallatin NF in 2003 indicate that OHV use currently comprises a small percentage of overall recreation use on the Forest. Again - please see Chapter 3 - Issue 16 Recreation Effects for a complete review of use

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						information and trends. We believe there is adequate capacity for current and projected demand for motorized recreation activities with the route configuration proposed in Alternative 7M. Alternative 7M responds to many comments that by providing more separated motorized and non-motorized opportunities particularly in front country settings we will reduce user conflicts, not increase them.
Paul Herbel		927	Bozeman	I'm a backcountry motorist. I've been a steward if you will in the Buffalo Horn, Porcupine WSA especially. Who will provide that free service when the trails are kept from me or limited to 7 weeks a year or closed on weekends, like your proposal of Portal Creek to Windy Pass. I ride on Sundays. How can I get off the southern end of the Crest Trail if the route out is closed to motorized on weekends. Motorcycling grows in popularity each year, yet you propose taking half the trails away. Won't this lead to over-use and ultimately the closure of those remaining OHV areas too? .	Motorized (General)	Alternative 7M proposes to allow motorcycles to access the Porcupine Buffalo Horn Loops, and the Gallatin Crest Trail north of Windy Pass. Access to the Crest would be provided in Portal Creek on the Moose Creek Trail #187 from July 15 through September 5, with no weekend restrictions. We believe there is adequate capacity for current and projected demand for motorized recreation activities with the route configuration proposed in Alternative 7M.
Patrick Holland		929	Bozeman	Motorized trails often causes noise, congestion and erosion in the areas of use. I hope that motorized use is prohibited on the "M" and Cottonwood trails. I feel that the use of snowmobiles in Middle Cottonwood and Truman Gulch trails should be prohibited. In the Gallatin Range I feel strongly that the use of snowmobiles and motorcycles should be prohibited north of Ramshorn Lake along Windy Pass to Hyalite Peak. The same goes for trails along the Gallatin Crest and Emerald and Hyalite Lakes. The conscientious use of these areas now will only pay dividends in the future as pristine areas of quiet retreat, wildlife, amazing views, and wonderful wildflowers that will become an increasingly valuable asset to Montana's people.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Kevin Jacobson		932	Bozeman	Roads built in the early 20th century are now the backbone of the road and trail system throughout the Forest. This access backbone must be maintained in order to disperse use as efficiently as possible. Do everything to maintain those access points.	Motorized (General)	The preferred alternative proposed in the Gallatin Travel Plan will make very few changes to the open road system on the Forest today. Currently there are about 725 miles of roads open to passenger cars, the preferred alternative would manage about the same number of miles of roads open to passenger cars.
Allen Langfeldt		942	Great Falls	Motorized recreation is growing and by shutting these areas down you will increase the traffic in the	Motorized (General)	We think that concentrating motorized use will be beneficial in a number of ways, both to the trails as well

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				areas that are left open and then you are going to close that on us b/c of the impact of having a growing sport in smaller and smaller area. There is little to no damage done by machines that are traveling over snow to the ground that is frozen solid with the native plants gone dormant.		as other resources. We propose to shift some OHV use to old roads because roads are built to absorb more use. Trails that will be open to OHV use will be maintained to standard for those uses. Concentrating use also allows us to concentrate our dollars and resources on specific routes. Concentrating use can be helpful to wildlife - it expands core habitat and allows more places where wildlife can disperse, and finally concentrating use allows us to provide separate areas dedicated to non-motorized recreation, minimizing conflicts.
Roger Lund/ Marion Lund		945	Paradise	My own study and my observations made over the last 50 years while performing my professional forestry activities have shown clearly that soil disturbance and/or compaction resulting from motorcycle/scooter use on FS trails is of far less impact than horse use. However, horse use is provided for on FS trails in preference to motorcycle use. Our population is growing older. Many of us are nearing or passed the age when we are able to walk even 1 mile to reach forest areas we all enjoy so greatly, or to hunt or fish as we used to. Many of us rely on our 4x4 pickup and off-road motorcycles or ATVs to get us into the backcountry of Montana.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Dyarle Sharkey		975	Kalama WA	You need to open more land to snowmobiles because they do not disturb the land at all. They are used on snow that melts in the spring.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
David Govus		1013	Ellijay GA	A few trips by an ATV or dirt bike w/ their spinning rough tread tires can equal the impact of a season of horse by many years of hiking by thousands.	Motorized (General)	Please see Chapter 3 Issue 19: Soils for a discussion on the various impacts from different users.
Kerry White		1616		The motorized users are the workhorses in our forest. I have been doing trail work for 40 years and I know many, many other motorized users that have done the same. This should be very important when creating the travel plan. Volunteer maintenance is the cheapest you will find.	Motorized (General)	Volunteer work to supplement trail maintenance is an important component of the overall program, providing critical supplements to work we accomplish with appropriated dollars. It is a program the Forest will continue to nurture.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Linda Ellison		1070		Forest-wide, there needs to be flexibility in the opening/closing dates for motorized use too, not just for horses and bicycles. This idea is not conveyed in an understandable fashion in the DEIS and could be discriminatory in nature if different dates apply on the same trail or road.	Motorized (General)	Seasonal restrictions for the preferred alternative are described in the detailed description of the alternatives. We will be implementing the travel plan decision under the new regulations tied to the National OHV Decision (See 36 CFR 212.56) Agency policy that implement this decision mandate that we have fixed open and closing dates for seasonal restrictions. These are clearly displayed in the detailed description of the alternatives.
Linda Ellison		1070		Allowing travel up to 300 feet off of a designated route, both roads and trails, is a very important opportunity for the public. The ability to reach dispersed campsites would be unreasonably compromised without this access. There is a shortage of dispersed camping areas along all of our motorize routes.	Motorized (General)	Alternative 7M proposes to continue to allow travel off of designated routes within 300' to access campsites that was established in the Montana Dakota OHV decision to access campsites. See the detailed description of the decision - goals, objectives and standards section.
Ted Lange		1094		Motorized use and small children are not compatible. For small children 4-wheeler OHVs, motorcycles, and snowmobiles roaring past can be terrifying and are sometimes seriously dangerous. Areas that are heavily used by families should not be open to motorized use.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Motorized users support active management of trails through justified timing restrictions rather than the non-management option of total closure.	Motorized (General)	Thank you for your comment.
Michael S. Ross		1039	Bozeman	My preference for snowmobile use is strictly to established roads or trails and to be used to get a person into more assessable country where they could use other forms of recreation such as snowshoeing or cross-country skiing.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
George Gallagher		1286	Bozeman	There are many areas closed to motorized vehicles for various reasons. A few of these are Bozeman Creek, Cottonwood Creek, Cottonwood Lake North of Bozeman, plus there are many canyons and draws closed because there is no public access. If	Motorized (General)	We think that concentrating motorized use will be beneficial in a number of ways, both to the trails as well as other resources. We propose to shift some OHV use to old roads because roads are built to absorb more use. Trails that will be open to OHV use will be maintained to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				you close more areas as the forest service proposes you will in a fact push motorized recreation into a smaller area thus creating more conflicts than already exist.		standard for those uses. Concentrating use also allows us to concentrate our dollars and resources on specific routes. Concentrating use can be helpful to wildlife - it expands core habitat and allows more places where wildlife can disperse, and finally concentrating use allows us to provide separate areas dedicated to non-motorized recreation, minimizing conflicts.
Gerald Geiszler		1288	Great Falls	Areas of heavy fire danger could have combination fire break trails built which would provide dual benefits. The current trend to push more and more people out of our forest is selfish and wrong.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Brad Grein	Citizens For Balanced Use	1302		Anyone that has lived here for any length of time should know that the time in which trails in the Gallatin forest should be used each spring can vary as much as two months or more. A blanket opening date is senseless.	Motorized (General)	The preferred alternative has identified a number of dates for spring opening on routes where seasonal restrictions are proposed. Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives, Chapter II for a discussion on seasonal restrictions and the rationale for the specific dates.
Julie Hager		1306		Have you considered that by closing even one area, you increase the traffic and use in others? By forcing users into smaller and smaller areas with closures, the remaining open areas will not be able to handle the increased traffic, which will lead to more closures.	Motorized (General)	We think that concentrating motorized use will be beneficial in a number of ways, both to the trails as well as other resources. We propose to shift some OHV use to old roads because roads are built to absorb more use. Trails that will be open to OHV use will be maintained to standard for those uses. Concentrating use also allows us to concentrate our dollars and resources on specific routes. Concentrating use can be helpful to wildlife - it expands core habitat and allows more places where wildlife can disperse, and finally concentrating use allows us to provide separate areas dedicated to non-motorized recreation, minimizing conflicts.
David Courts		276	Washington	I encourage the Forest to establish and enforce regulations that require ATVs, motorcycles and snow machines to have effective mufflers that reduce their engine noise to the equivalent of a passenger car.	Motorized (General)	Noise is regulated in Montana on public lands by Montana State Code 61-9-418. This law states that all motorcycles or quadricycles operated on streets and highways in the state shall be equipped with noise suppression devices at all times. Forest roads and trails are considered public ways under this law, and are covered by this requirement. For any cycles manufactured after 1987, the decibel limit is 70 dbA,

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						measured at 50 feet. For snowmobiles, the same requirement applies (Montana Code 23-2-634) with a decibel limitation on machines that were built after 1975 of 78 dbA, measured at 50 feet.
Colby Ricks		513	Yakima, WA	I do not agree with shutting down more area to motorized vehicles. There is no need to keep the majority of forest users out of the forest. From my understanding Wilderness study areas need to be maintained at uses prior to 1977 in the described area. Snowmobiling in Rock Creek and Hyalite has been going on since 1968. Grizzly Bear populations are growing significantly under the current plan. Why do we need to change the system when it is functioning for both animals and humans? There has been no proof of ill effects on the Lynx and Wolverine. Do not take more land from the majority of people who use the land. This will force more people into smaller areas causing the areas to be over crowded, which will cause you to close all of the areas in the future.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Duane D. Cassidy		515	Great Falls	I would like to see most of the trails stay at the current status for motorized use! The Cabin Creek trails #203, Red Cub Trail #205, plus #207 and #210 will give a loop for better riding opportunities! If left open! The Deer Creeks closures in the Travel Plan cut most of the loops and it will cause more impact in smaller areas. My son and I have ridden most of the areas listed in the Travel Plan, and have seen minimal damage, or user conflict.	Motorized (General)	Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative proposes to manage many of the existing trails in the Deer Creek Area as open to motorcycles, or ATVs. Several of the trails you note in Cabin Creek are also proposed to be managed as open to motorcycles. Please see the summer motorized map for alternative 7M.
Brian Littleton		520	Thayne, WY	I am writing to oppose any additional creation of Wilderness Areas or "Roadless Areas" in above subject National Forest. …please explain how you intend to comply with The Americans with Disabilities Act if our handicapped can not use powered vehicles to enjoy their Parks???	Motorized (General)	The creation of additional wilderness is an act reserved to Congress - this travel plan does not propose any additional wilderness. Roadless lands are merely described by an inventory - which was displayed in the roadless final rule and in Appendix C of our Forest Plan. The travel plan does not propose any re-evaluation of management in roadless - but tiers to the existing direction in our Forest Plan. Under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, no person with a disability can be denied participation in a Federal program that is available to all other people solely because of his or her disability. In conformance with section 504, all wheelchairs that meet the definition in 36 CFR 212.1 are welcome on all National Forest System Lands that

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						are open to foot travel. These wheelchairs are specifically exempted from the definition of motor vehicle in 36 CFR 212.1, even if they are battery powered. However, there is no legal requirement to allow people with disabilities to use OHV's or other motor vehicles on roads or trails closed to motor vehicles because such an exemption would undercut the resource protection afforded by the closure and therefore could fundamentally alter the nature of the Forest Service's travel management program.
Rhonda Mumm		543	Rapid City, SD	Every forest in the nation is aware of a growing need for recreational trails for an ever increasing number of OHV trail users. The numbers prove that it is an acceptable form of recreation, yet I noticed on your plan that you are decreasing the miles of trails open to OHV. This kind of thinking goes nowhere towards a solution to provide recreation opportunities, you are forcing a growing number into smaller spaces, this in the long run will only compound your problem.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Dennis O. and Margaret Brandon		318		retrieving wild game after 12 o'clock noon with no gun and on 4 wheelers or snow machines would cut down on overuse and serve a good purpose.	Motorized (General)	Standard A-6 in the preferred alternative would prohibit cross country travel for game retrieval at any time. This is in keeping with direction in the Montana Dakota OHV decision and guidance for implementing the new National OHV decision.
Roger Jenkins		752	Bozeman	Outside of existing Wilderness areas, it is hard to find a watershed (and thus, noise-shed) where a horse-person or hiker or cross-country skier does not have to "share", during some portion of the year, either the trail in the valley, or the ridgeline above the valley, with a motorized vehicle.	Motorized (General)	We heard from many recreationists during several comment opportunities that they believed more access to separated non-motorized recreation opportunities was important - particularly in front-country non-wilderness settings. The preferred alternative strives to provide a balance of motorized and non-motorized opportunities in these areas.
Barry Krayer		756		There is already too much wasted wilderness lands and the Gallatin that 98% of Americans cannot access. Motorized use is expanding at a healthy rate and should be planned for by increasing areas for this popular activity.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Donald Lovely		758	Helena	Dividing the national forest into a multitude of planning units may be necessary and easier for you to develop a plan. However, from a forest -- user perspective or an enforcement perspective is this complexity really necessary in the final plan? For instance, really, how significant are the benefits gained by having the off-road vehicle access closures on a myriad of different dates like September 15, September 30, October 15, etc.? Many off road vehicle users hunt upland birds and access backcountry for archery hunting seasons which extend into October. Will these restrictions force them to choose to hunt only in those units having later closing dates, therefore, concentrating more users and fewer areas and causing greater impacts? wouldn't the simplicity of standardized opening/closing dates make more sense in lieu of the minor benefits gained in one unit versus another?	Motorized (General)	In the travel plan preferred alternative, one of our goals was definitely to simplify the number of open and closing dates from the current configuration. The division of the Forest into 39 travel planning areas wasn't really related to the seasonal restriction dates, but rather a "geographic zoning" for logical areas where we were striving to provide a certain sort of experience. The preferred alternative does strive to keep seasonal restrictions to a minimum number of dates, however, wildlife concerns, different facility concerns, and varying dates when areas dry out and become durable for travel all lead to a handful of seasonal restriction dates in the preferred alternative. Please see Chapter II of the Detailed Description of the Alternatives for a complete list of dates, and their rationale. Refer to the Record of Decision for the final list of dates.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Seasonal restrictions on motorized use need to be adopted Forest-wide. Winter restrictions for wheeled OHVs should begin by November 15 to protect ski opportunities early in winter, and the snowmobiling season should end on March 31 instead of June 1 (Adequate snow cover is usually gone by the end of March, and snowmobile travel on inadequate cover damages vegetation and disperses weed seeds). Also, wheeled OHVs can cause as much or more early-season damage than bikes or horses, so the early season restrictions on OHVs should be included here as well.	Motorized (General)	The preferred alternative describes seasonal restrictions for many activities. Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives, Chapter II for a generic description of the proposed seasonal restrictions, and the individual travel planning area route tables for details on which restrictions are proposed for which routes. The preferred alternative does not describe a "snowmobile season" starting and ending date, except in those few areas where snowmobiles would be restricted in the fall between October 15 and December 2. Please see the winter maps for a description of those areas. Snowmobile travel is self limiting by adequate snowfall - the Forest is not aware of any other resource issues that would compel us to impose additional restrictions.
Ron Orton		1472b		Motorcycles (ATVs and snowmachines) should have noise restrictions, trail tires (don't allow knobbies they belong on a race track) and everyone should be permitted through required training. Again, money goes toward maintenance and enforcement through volunteers.	Motorized (General)	Please see the discussion in Chapter 3 on Noise. Noise emissions from OHV's and snowmobiles are currently regulated by the State of Montana. No alternative considers regulating things like type of tires, or requiring special training and permitting for any user group. No information was presented to the Agency that would compel us to believe those measures are necessary to protect resources at this time.
	Capital Trail Vehicle	619		The decision results in a disparity not just in the quantity of motorized recreational opportunities	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Association			versus non-motorized recreation but also in the quality of motorized recreational opportunities in comparison with non-motorized recreational opportunities. Where is it written in the law that motorized recreationists do not have equal access to both an equal level opportunities and an equal quality of opportunities and that non-motorized opportunities have priority over motorized opportunities? The Forest Service preferred alternative does not adequately address this critical issue and we request that it be fully addressed.		of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		The DEIS does not add the number of miles of motorized trails closed to the current miles of non-motorized trails as a measure of the change in non-motorized recreational opportunity. Non-motorized recreationist use roads that are closed and benefit from them because closed roads are open to use by only non-motorized recreationists. When roads are closed to motorized recreationists, then they in reality become a non-motorized recreational resource and they must be disclosed as such. Unfortunately this has not been evaluated and disclosed and the miles of recreational resources have been understated in favor of non-motorized recreationists. We request that this procedure be used by this project and in all future agency projects. Additionally, we request that the cumulative negative impact on motorized recreationists resulting from this lack of adequate accounting be evaluated and adequately mitigated as part of this project.	Motorized (General)	All trails that are open for motorized recreation are also "counted" as open to hiking and stock - though hiking and stock use may not be shown as "emphasized" on all of these routes. Over 2000 miles of trail are shown as available for hiking or stock use, including all motorized trails. All areas of the Gallatin National Forest are available to foot travel at any time - not just closed roads. This analysis was designed to evaluate the effects of actively managed roads and trails that are within our system - and provides a reasonable comparison of those activities, it does not attempt to evaluate every acres' potential to provide some sort of opportunity.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		Motorized closures are being enacted incrementally and without adequate disclosure and consideration of the cumulative effects. If 25 to 50% of the existing motorized recreational opportunities are closed in each successive travel, then over the course of 3 travel planning cycles or about 30 years in a given area, only 13 to 42% of the original motorized recreational opportunities will remain at the end of the third cycle. The DEIS for the Gallatin National Forest project does not adequately recognize and address this trend. We ask that this significant negative cumulative effect on motorized recreationists be adequately recognized, evaluated	Motorized (General)	Cumulative effect of changing recreation opportunities was considered - please see Chapter 3: Issue 16 Recreation for more details of that analysis.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				and mitigated at all levels starting with this project.		
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		It is obvious by looking at the non-motorized and motorized routes maps for alternative 7, that there are many non-motorized loops, a comprehensive network of non-motorized trails and many, many high quality non-motorized destination trails. At the same time, the motorized trail system is highly fragmented, lacking loops, and dysfunctional recreation resource. We ask for development of motorized recreational opportunities equal in number and quality of non-motorized recreational opportunities.	Motorized (General)	The travel planning process weighed heavily the quality of opportunities to be provided for all users. While the preferred alternative may reduce the number of "prime" destination spots for motorized users for a variety of reasons, we actively designed more loops and connected routes in the motorized trails proposed in the preferred alternative than exist today. A large percentage of "new" construction that is proposed in the preferred alternative is designed to improve the quality of motorized trails. We do not agree that providing "equal" recreation opportunities will necessarily lead to the best travel plan. Instead we believe providing a broad mix of opportunities that the resource is capable of supporting and which responds to social issues should be the desired future condition. This may not be an "equal" mix of opportunities in some locations. Please see the Record of Decision for more discussion on decision criteria and rationale for the final alternative.
Noreen Breeding		454		All motor vehicle drivers and their vehicles should be required to be legally licensed and registered, and, possibly, certified in compliance by the FS. Other National Forests require this. If pedestrians are forced to share narrow trails with motor vehicles, should the drivers not be required to have been formally trained and licensed?	Motorized (General)	All motor vehicle drivers and their vehicles (including OHVs) that drive on roads that are also open to passenger car vehicles are required to meet State of Montana driver and vehicle licensing requirements, unless it is a lower standard (4x4 high clearance) road that has been dual designated as an OHV trail. The State does not currently require OHV riders to be licensed who are traveling exclusively on trails.
Janet Krob		1685	Bozeman	The reality is that it is imperative that more areas be opened to multiple accesses to alleviate the growing recreational population not only in Gallatin Valley but all across Montana. More folks are moving here for the opportunities to recreate. Closing areas that are/were open in counterproductive.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Keith Allen		1770		I would also encourage the GNF to think outside the box with regards to their travel management issues. I believe there is plenty of room for creative solutions. For example: I strongly support seasonal closures rather than total closures, tread width and	Motorized (General)	The preferred alternative will employ some "time share" methods on motorized routes close to Bozeman - where trails are open on certain days of the week or month to motorized users, and closed on other days. The exact details of this "time share" philosophy will be worked out

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				sound level limitation to limit erosion and enhance other's outdoors experience, FS approved motorized patrols (see the San Bernardino National Forest travel management plan), that motorized users are being under utilized as an aid to assessing wildlife health and as an aid to controlling fires since motorcycles can quickly access rugged backcountry areas - make motorcyclists a benefit rather than perceiving them as a liability. I believe in the concept of trail rotation whereby trails are closed for a year or two to allow them to heal.		after the Record of Decision is implemented. Noise is regulated in Montana on public lands by Montana State Code 61-9-418. This law states that all motorcycles or quadricycles operated on streets and highways in the state shall be equipped with noise suppression devices at all times. Forest roads and trails are considered public ways under this law, and are covered by this requirement. For any cycles manufactured after 1987, the decibel limit is 70 dbA, measured at 50 feet. For snowmobiles, the same requirement applies (Montana Code 23-2-634) with a decibel limitation on machines that were built after 1975 of 78 dbA, measured at 50 feet. No alternative is currently considering trail rotation as you suggest - but this option could be considered in the future.
Brian Hawthorn	Blue Ribbon Coalition	1196		Closures are eminent in some areas and existing motorized use will be displaced to other areas. In order to minimize impacts to the remaining roads, trails and areas open for OHV use should allow for additional access and additional recreational opportunities in suitable areas.	Motorized (General)	We aren't certain by your comment if you are concerned with the ability to access campsite off of designated routes or if your concern is more about providing developed recreation facilities that enhance access to motorized trails. Alternative 7M proposes to continue to allow travel off of designated routes within 300' to access campsites that was established in the Montana Dakota OHV decision to access campsites. See the detailed description of the decision - goals, objectives and standards section.
David Scrimm	Montana Wilderness Association	1910	Bozeman	The DEIS also fails to address the need for ORV users to locate campsites along motorized trails on the forest. It has been the experience of our many members that ORV users do not carry camping equipment on their vehicles to remote campsites, but rather use developed campsites as a base or use legal or illegal pullout type campsites on county or forest roads.	Motorized (General)	Alternative 7M proposes to continue to allow motor vehicle travel off of designated routes within 300' to access campsites, so long as that travel does not cause resource damage. This direction was established in the Montana Dakota OHV decision, our travel plan preferred alternative carries it forward. See the detailed description of the decision - goals, objectives and standards section.
Ken Salo	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1916	Helena	We request that the proposed plan be redone and that the allocation of multiple-use and motorized recreational resources be based on the fact that 95% of the visitors needs those opportunities and would use them. Wilderness visits are not growing nearly as fast as multiple-use visits. Therefore, we also request that the proposed plan provide for a growth rate of motorized recreational opportunities that matches the growing popularity.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Ken Salo	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1916		The proposed Travel Plan does not adequately address where motorized recreationists will go to replace the motorized access and motorized recreational opportunities that will be lost when the new Travel Plan is enacted. We request careful consideration of this impact and a plan to mitigate this significant impact.	Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Daryl Blanksma		1193		Many of the trails would closed after September 5 or September 15. I have found some of the best trail riding opportunities in the fall. The trails are generally dry at this time and the peak of summer use is over. I see no reason that the motorcycle season riding season could not be extended in the fall until the last of October.	Motorized (General)	Trail conditions generally are good in the fall as you note. The September 5 date proposed for some trails is largely predicated on providing secure grizzly bear habitat during important fall feeding times. Please see the grizzly bear issue in Chapter 3. The September 15 date was designed to do two things - provide secure wildlife habitat in some critical areas, and to provide areas for non-motorized hunting opportunities. Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives, Chapter II for a discussion of the rationale for different seasonal restrictions.
Orvin Loterbauer	MTVRA, CBU, Blue Ribbon Coalition	151		I see that my group suggestion of week day only on trail open to motorcycle have been expanded to trails south of Big Sky and south of Taylor Fork this was a way to reduce user conflicts close to the Bozeman area where after 5 pm motorized recreation could be done. The trips on motorized trails on the HBHP are weekend Saturday a& Sunday recreation tours and can not be accomplished within safe times of the day after 5 pm and week days.	Motorized (General)	The preferred alternative only proposes to use the "time share" concept where motorized trails would be closed to motorized use during certain days of the week, or some other schedule on a handful of trails close to Bozeman, in the Bridgers and Hyalite area. Please see the Record of Decision for the final details on "time share" proposals. The preferred alternative does not propose any weekend restrictions in the HPBH at this time.
Douglas L. Kary		824	Billings	I am an advocate for promoting a 'special' permit for driver and vehicle. This only after a test had been taken and at least an hour or two of classroom instruction. We need to educate ALL to take care of the resources we are using.	Motorized (General)	Thank you for your suggestion. At this time, no resource concerns have been brought to our attention which would warrant the need for special licensing or restrictions for motorized users. Licensing of vehicles and riders on public roads is regulated by the State of Montana.
Russ Ehnes	MTVRA	837		The concept of area closure is not consistent with Forest Service regulations as established by appeals to the Stanislaus National Forest Travel Management Plan. Alternative # 7 and the segregation that it presents is an over-reaction to the perceived conflicts. Using area closure as a management technique does not meet the needs of	Motorized (General)	Alternatives 2-7M are all consistent with the Montana Dakota OHV decision of 2001 and the recent National OHV direction provided in a final rule amending travel planning policy in 2005. Under the new national policy the "closed unless designated open" policy will be implemented using maps as the legal enforcement tool, not relying on posted signs on the ground. We intend to

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the existing users of the area. Fair, diverse and equitable solutions should be a major goal. The USFS continues to state they do not have the funding for trail maintenance or trail reconstruction. There are many clubs and associations throughout the area that are willing to volunteer projects on other forests and successful relationships between local clubs, associations and District Rangers. Furthermore, the signing of "closed unless posted open" is not consistent with the 3-state OHV Decision and is confusing to the public. Signs will become damaged and/or destroyed and then the public does not know whether they are legally open or closed.		provide signs to help users identify where legal motorized routes are located (and to denote which routes are closed) during the transition. The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Beverly Dawson		904	Livingston	Livingston area cyclists are limited by the trails accessing the Gallatin Crest. I would like to see Lewis Creek #181 remain open to mtn biking. In the Hyalite drainage there is a need to structure specific user days for different user groups on the Hyalite and Heather Lake trails. These are both fantastic mtn bike trails.	Mountain Bikes	In the FEIS we considered leaving the Lewis Creek Trail open to mountain bikes in alternatives 1-4. The preferred alternative proposed to manage this route as closed to mountain bikes to provide areas where recreationists can find conditions similar to those in 1977 when the area was designated as a wilderness study area. The preferred alternative proposing to use a "time share" concept for mountain biking and motorcycling on the Hyalite and Heather and Emerald Trails. Please see the Record of Decision for the final details relating to "time share".
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The FS has dismissed restricting mountain bikes to designated routes on the grounds that there are no known areas of the forest where off-route mountain bike use is impacting forest resources. We encourage you to reconsider this reactive position. It is unnecessary to wait until the use becomes established and resource damage occurs before the action is taken. By acting now, the Forest Service can avoid the resource damage and the conflict that would result in having to limit a recreational use after it has developed a constituency.	Mountain Bikes	We appreciate your concern about mountain bike use off of designated routes. At this time we do not believe this concern is "ripe" for decision, but have acknowledged in the effects discussion in Chapter 3 (see the Recreation issue) that growth in mountain biking in the future may compel us to revisit this decision in the future.
David Courtis		276		Uninventoried motorized trails: I think that mountain bikes should also be prohibited. My concern is that if mountain bikes are allowed, motorcycle users (and then ATV users) will be tempted to start reusing these discontinued routes. Also, all of these unauthorized motorcycle trail should be obliterated.	Mountain Bikes	We appreciate your concern about mountain bike use off of designated routes. At this time we do not believe this concern is "ripe" for decision, but have acknowledged in the effects discussion in Chapter 3 (see the Recreation issue) that growth in mountain biking in the future may compel us to revisit this decision in the future. Motorized users will be restricted to designated routes, consistent

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						with the direction in the Montana/Dakota OHV decision and new National regulations regarding travel management.
Michelle Stevens-Orton		1472a		I am also concerned with the Forest-wide June 15th opening of trails to mountain bikes. I am concerned that I will not be able to ride until June 15th. We know how to use our judgment and avoid wet trails.	Mountain Bikes	In the FEIS preferred alternative - the "blanket" spring time restrictions for stock and mountain biking are dropped. We heard from many commenters that they felt this measure was unnecessary to protect trails, and that they would be self policing when trails were vulnerable to damage. Instead - about a dozen specific trails have been identified with spring facility protection issues where stock and mountain bikes would be prohibited. Please see the detailed description of the alternatives for this information.
Ron Orton		1472b		Opening dates of trails are arbitrary. For instance, I generally ride Sypes Canyon when conditions allow. Sypes can be ridable in April and sometimes March. Most Mtn. bikers do not like the consequences of mud in their components. Some will ride in the mud a few times before they get tired of it. Again, permit, educate, and use money for maintenance before you restrict our access.	Mountain Bikes	In the FEIS preferred alternative - the "blanket" spring time restrictions for stock and mountain biking are dropped. We heard from many commenters that they felt this measure was unnecessary to protect trails, and that they would be self policing when trails were vulnerable to damage. Instead - about a dozen specific trails have been identified with spring facility protection issues where stock and mountain bikes would be prohibited. Please see the detailed description of the alternatives for this information.
Alex Phillips		1483a		Mountain bike etiquette on the Gallatin is sorely behind the times. Most other forests and BLM lands have signs posted explaining that bikers need to yield to horses and hikers. The agency has the great opportunity to extend a helping hand to the mountain bike groups to help with etiquette and education just like the FS already does for snowmobilers with their avalanche classes and brochures on off road driving.	Mountain Bikes	We agree that the Forest could do a better job of educating recreationists on biking etiquette and look forward to the opportunity to work with partners to accomplish those goals.
Turk Comstock		1891		Any trail suitable for hiking is plenty good enough to bike on. Mountain bikers don't need fancy bridges or other trail improvements, we are hikers with bikes and should be allowed to continue our use until it is demonstrated that there is indeed a problem	Mountain Bikes	Forest Service mountain bike trail standards are very similar to those for hiking and stock use, with a few minor changes (like using rolling dips instead of wood water bars to move water off of trails). The preferred alternative would allow mountain bikes to access almost the entire non-wilderness trail system. The preferred alternative would prohibit mountain bikes on about 135 miles of non-wilderness trails, in places where our easements prohibit bikes, on short pieces of trail that lead to designated wilderness and on some trails within the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area that had no historic bike use.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Dan French		1898	Emigrant	Please consider letting WSA and bicycles co-exist. There are so few people in these areas of the backcountry user conflict seems to be non-existent, and these areas provide a unique bike riding experience from Hyalite to Big Creek watershed, Bark Cabin Trail, Windy Pass Trail, Eaglehead Trail, Mt. Blackmore Trail, S. Cottonwood Trail.	Mountain Bikes	The preferred alternative 7M would manage many of the trails in the WSA as open to mountain bikes. Please see the summer non-motorized map for more details.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Currently, of the 19 trailheads within a half hour drive of Bozeman, just six are designated for non-motorized use. This distriution of trails does not reflect that the majority of forest visitors are not coming for motorized recreation on the Gallatin. If trend predictions are accurate then distribution of trails will be even more skewed resulting in conflicts that could be avoided by making decisions using your data to plan for future use rather than current use.	Non-Motorized (General)	It is correct that currently about 70% of the trail opportunities within a 30 mile drive of Bozeman are open to motorized use. The travel plan team recognized this distribution of opportunity issue, and designed several alternatives which would provide additional front country non-motorized opportunities close to communities. Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative would shift the existing number of non-motorized opportunities within 30 miles of Bozeman from about 30% today to a configuration that would provide about 57% of the trails for non-motorized recreation opportunities in the summer. Additionally the decision will consider a "time share" component to several other popular routes in the Bridgers and Northern Gallatin Range, where routes that are proposed to be open for motorized use, would be managed as non-motorized during certain days of the week or weeks of the month during the summer season. See the Record of Decision for the final description of the "time share" proposal.
Greg Sularz		1134		By increasing opportunities for non-motorized special use permits many more people will have access to this rugged daunting area. Permits that allow guided skiing, mountain biking, and hiking will draw new cliental to the area.	Non-Motorized (General)	Offering additional recreation special use permits is outside of the scope of this decision.
Kathy Lange		476	Bozeman	I am writing to urge you to protect the Hyalite Range. The trails are far too fragile for motorized use. I speak personally of Leverich Canyon. The motorized bikes that ride up the canyon of late have caused delicate streams to resemble battle zones. Please consider the small valuable trails as well as the larger, more used paths.	Non-motorized (General)	Alternative 7M - the preferred alternative proposes to manage the Leverich Canyon trail as closed to motorized uses.
Marlene Renwyck		496	Livingston	While we support a limited amount of motorized recreational use, it is time to acknowledge that the carrying capacity of the land around us will not sustain the ongoing increase in the number of Forest visitors. It is time to establish that all public lands on	Non-motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the Gallatin NF are closed to motorized use unless clearly signed 'open' to motorized use.		alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan, and will manage all motorized use on designated routes in sync with the Montana Dakota OHV decision and new National direction on managing summer motorized recreation.
Dean Littlepage		519	Bozeman	I am a regular hiker and backpacker and an occasional mountain biker, and frequently hike the Middle Cottonwood and Foothills trails in the Bridgers and the Hyalite, East Hyalite, South Cottonwood, and Blackmore trails in the Hyalites. I also have taken some fine trips on the Gallatin Crest, up Corbly Gulch to Sacagawea, and in and through the Tom Miner/Gallatin Petrified Forest areas. All these areas should be motor free. Designating them for motorcycle use as proposed is at odds with prevailing uses and with protection of the beautiful meadows where these trails lead; the petrified forest; intact streams, streambanks, and fish habitat; secure elk and bear habitat; and weed-free native vegetation. About two-thirds of the trailheads within half an hour of the city access trails that are proposed as open to motorized vehicles, a recommendation I find inappropriate and clearly out of balance, given the demographics of trail users and projections of future demand, all of which are listed in great detail in the DEIS. I think it's time to "time-zone" the Hyalite area trails to balance mechanized and non-mechanized uses, through complementary, split week designations because of heavy use and conflicts.	Non-motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan, and will manage all motorized use on designated routes in sync with the Montana Dakota OHV decision and new National direction on managing summer motorized recreation. Additionally the decision will consider a "time share" component to several popular routes in the Bridgers and Northern Gallatin Range, where routes that are proposed to be open for motorized use, would be managed as non-motorized during certain days of the week or weeks of the month during the summer season. See the Record of Decision for the final description of the "time share" proposal.
Gene Ball		527	Cody, WY	…please maintain the maximum number of non-motorized trails. It seem like everywhere I go where a motorized user can get to - there's always signs of abuse - off trail scarring - more litter - expanded trail marks - more erosion, etc. …So please manage Lionhead as wilderness and limit any motorized (summer & winter) in the Bridger & Gallatins.	Non-motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		The DEIS recognizes the difficulty of balancing the "land -- hungry" demands of motorized use with the "much faster growing demand for quiet trails activities". Overall, we urge you to make long-term stewardship and the traditional principle of managing "for the greatest good for the greatest number and the long run" the guiding principles for travel plan decisions.	Non-Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		To be in compliance with 36 CFR 295.2 the FS must manage significant blocks of land, not just scattered individual trails and small areas, as motor free. The areas must be of sufficient size to avoid direct contact between motorized and non-motorized users and provide space where the non-motorized user can avoid hearing, seeing, or smelling motorized traffic. The most appropriate areas for providing non-motorized opportunities are the Gallatin's roadless areas, including the HPBH WSA, the two RWs, and inventoried and uninventoried roadless areas, e.g. the West Bridgers and the Crazies. The WSA and the West Bridgers, in particular, are deficient in large blocks of motor-free terrain.	Non-Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan. 36 CFR 295.2 was recently replaced with new regulations as a result of what is often referred to as the National OHV Rule. The new regulations can be found in 36 CFR 212.55 and provide direction for the Forest Service to consider separation of uses where necessary to address conflicts between motor vehicle use and other recreation use. The travel plan recognized it was important to provide separated opportunities for motorized and non-motorized recreation in a variety of settings and explored this through a variety of alternatives.
June Billings Safford		633		Perhaps a Never on Sunday policy for motorcycles and mountain bikes might be a good idea, as there is a great potential for accidents to take place.	Non-Motorized (General)	The preferred alternative will employ some "time share" methods on motorized routes close to Bozeman - where trails are open on certain days of the week or month to motorized users, and closed on other days. The exact details of this "time share" philosophy will be determined with the help of user groups during implementation.
Noreen Breeding		454		Seasonal restrictions on motorized use need to be adopted forest-wide. Winter restrictions should start about a month earlier than December 1 or 2 and/or be more flexible to protect natural resources and ski	Non-Motorized (General)	The preferred alternative describes seasonal restrictions for many activities. Please see the Detailed Description of the Alternatives, Chapter II for a generic description of the proposed seasonal restrictions, and the individual

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				opportunities early in the winter, especially from ATV abuse.		travel planning area route tables for details on which restrictions are proposed for which routes. The preferred alternative does not describe a "snowmobile season" starting and ending date, except in those few areas where snowmobiles would be restricted in the fall between October 15 and December 2. Please see the winter maps for a description of those areas. Snowmobile travel is self limiting by adequate snowfall - the Forest is not aware of any other resource issues that would compel us to impose additional restrictions.
Kathleen Rivers		770	Ketchum, ID	Presently there are approximately only 1Analysis: Issues (General)0,000 of non-wilderness acres closed to snowmobiles in winter and 959,3Fairy Lake Travel Planning Area acres open to snowmobiles. This disparity is completely unfair given that there are two user groups - fairness dictates that there is wilderness that is closed. However, virtually all of that acreage is remote and inaccessible to skiers and snowshoers. Skiers and snowshoers go not much further than a few miles from the highway rendering the wilderness inaccessible to them.	Non-Motorized (General)	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Chris Alkeny		203	Bozeman	Correct me if I am wrong but it looks as though there will be a closure to snowmobiles in the Northern Bridger's. I'm an avid backcountry skier/snowboarder and the only access is a 5-7 miles snowmobile ride to the base of the peaks. Without the use of sleds we will be forced to walk in which is fairly unrealistic. I know the ski community well and I know there are many others with the same concerns that don't even realize that there is a risk of closure. My livelihood as a photographer depends on being able to access the amazing terrain that we have into he Northern Bridger's	North Bridgers	In the preferred alternative - the Northern Bridgers (north of Flathead Pass) would be open to snowmobiles after December 2. In the area south of the Flathead Pass - the lower elevation areas, and an area around Fairy Lake would be open to snowmobiles. Please see the winter map for alternative 7M.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		Trail #46, Twin Cabin was also omitted from the tables, but is labeled on the maps as motor free, which we support.	Porcupine Buffalo-Horn	Thank you for noting that omission - it has been corrected in the FEIS.
Dallas O. Thompson		861	Bozeman	Teepee Creek is not a good cross-country ski area due to elk beds and too little snow, and should not be considered a major ski trail.	Porcupine Buffalo-Horn	In Alternative 7M, the Tepee Ck. Trail would not be managed as a ski trail. This was a map error displayed in the DEIS winter maps.
Noreen Breeding		1004	Bozeman	Designating Tepee Creek trail #39 as a ski trail in winter is ridiculous. There is never enough snow to cover the sagebrush and wintering elk there are better off left undisturbed.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	In Alternative 7M, the Tepee Ck. Trail would not be managed as a ski trail. This was a map error displayed in the DEIS winter maps.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Larry Ellison	Bitteroot/Grizzly Motorcycle Alliance	1190	Bozeman	In the porcupine-buffalo Horn travel Planning Area, the DEIS on pg 3-403 states, " Mitigation proposed includes motorized closures from September 15 to July 15 and mountain bike and stock closures from April 1 to June 15 for Alternatives 2-7." Restriction not applied fairly amongst user groups is discrimination.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Seasonal restrictions are designed to mitigate certain resource issues which may be perpetuated by different user groups in different ways at different times of the year. Restrictions are designed in the various alternatives to mitigate resource issues, and do not discriminate against any specific user group, rather target the resource issue at hand.
Kerry White		1616		Trail #1, connecting Buffalo Horn to Tom Miner Basin needs maintenance as horse travel has made deep ruts. This is the oldest trail in our forest and should be open to ATVs. This trail along with #199, 466, and 66 connected to from part of the Big Sky Trail and should be open to ATVs so we can perform maintenance in this area.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	All trails within the HPBH were single track routes at the time of designation, and were not being used by jeeps. In order to be consistent with the Montana Wilderness Study Act, and current Agency policy on the management of motorized vehicles in wilderness study areas, ATV's would be prohibited on all trails within the WSA under the preferred alternative.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Close the entire WSA to snowmobile use and relocate the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail outside the WSA boundary.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use (including snowmobiles) until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Paul D. Herbel		1330		Porcupine Buffalo Core Trails: July 15 to Sept 5 (7 weeks) is too short. Onion basin trail #34 needs to be opened. It takes bikes off the trail into Ramshorn Lake and diverts them up to Eaglehead Mountain. It also provides a loop opportunity while dispersing user groups. It provides an addition exit off the crest should weather or an emergency dictate.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Our proposed dates for opening trails within the HPBH in the preferred alternative are still July 15. Many of the trails lead to high elevation locations where snow blocks the trail well into July, the 15th is typically the earliest that the high elevation north slopes are snow free and not susceptible to damage. Lower elevations are important ungulate calving areas, where motorized travel can be detrimental. Motorcycling on certain routes within the HPBH would be permissible under the preferred alternative between July 15 and Sept. 5. The fall restriction is designed to protect grizzly bears during critical fall feeding times. The Onion Basin trail #34 would be closed to motorcycles in the preferred alternative to protect important wildlife habitat and to provide opportunities for non-motorized recreation.
George F. Hoffman		1335	Belgrade	Concerning the winter travel plan in the porcupine buffalo table, trails 1, 199, 466 would be closed. It appears from the wording, that a portion of the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail would be closed. It is very important to me that the Big Sky Routes remain open during snowmobile season and in its entirety	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	In the preferred alternative 7M the Big Sky Snowmobile trail would be open for it's entire length to snowmobiles.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We support the upgrade of the Buffalo Horn Pass-Ramshorn Lake user trail to a system trail if it is managed as a non-motorized and nonmechanized trail, in keeping with the preferred alternative and with Forest Service policy regarding bicycles and Montana WSA's.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	This trail would be managed for foot and stock travel in the preferred alternative.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Trail #34, Porcupine Creek, offers easy access for walkers, hikers, and horseback riders into the WSA. For these reasons, we support closure of this trail to motorcycles as well as to ATVs. In addition, enforcement here will be problematic due to the connection of this trail with other trails where motorized use is allowed under the preferred	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Trail #34 Porcupine Creek would be managed as open to motorcycles from July 15 - Sept. 5. It would be closed to all motorized uses the remainder of the year under the preferred alternative and would provide quality non-motorized opportunities for the bulk of the year.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				alternative.		
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Trail #46, Twin Cabin, which is currently designated as non-motorized, was omitted from the tables in the DEIS, but is included on the map says proposed to be motor free. We fully support the proposal, the note that on two MWA wilderness walks, participants witnessed motorcycles ascending the trail toward the WSA, through the closure to motorcycle use that was clearly posted at the trailhead.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Thank you for noting this omission. It was corrected in the FEIS. This trail would be managed as non-motorized in the preferred alternative 7M.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We have a major concern regarding ATV trails in the Hidden Lakes area that "dead end" at the WSA boundary or just inside the boundary. Motorized trails that lead to an unenforceable boundary of a motor free area invite trespass. Also, while this area is outside the WSA, it is an example of a fragile, back country roadless area that should be left motor free. We have expressed this concern in the previous two comment periods, but have seen nothing that addresses the enforcement problem.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	In the preferred alternative, ATV's would be allowed on the Hidden Lakes trail only as far as the lakes themselves. The trail traveling south from the lakes would be closed to ATV's. Providing quality destinations including lake destinations is important for motorized users, and this historically used route provides that quality opportunity.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Trail #299, Gallatin Crest-Upper Porcupine Creek, is labeled by number on the DEIS maps, but is not included in the summary tables. We support closing the trail to motorcycle use, and by policy, to bicycle use.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Thank you for noting this omission. It was corrected in the FEIS. This trail would be managed as non-motorized in the preferred alternative 7M.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		That opening of the area north of Trail #120 and east of Ramshorn Lake to snowmobiling is inconsistent with be MWSA and Forest Service policy. In addition, snowmobiling should be prohibited because this area overlaps the Gallatin #3 grizzly bear management area, with its secured grizzly habitat and den sights. Why does the Forest Service thinks snowmobile use hearer outweighs the wildlife and primitive recreation values of this area, and why should it be an exception to the MWSA and Forest Service policy?	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Determining the final configuration of snowmobile opportunities in the final travel plan within the HPBH study area was very challenging. The preferred alternative would drop the snowmobile connector between Buffalo Horn and Tom Minor, but maintain snowmobile access to the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail between Buffalo Horn and Portal Creek on a designated trail in a closed area. This route was established well before the wilderness study area. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration for winter uses in the HPBH.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Opportunities for skiers and snowshoers to travel into this part of the WSA, away from the noise and smell of snowmobiles, and on trails that are not packed hard or rutted by snowmobiles where skiers are subject to collision danger, are extremely limited. Only trails #46, #161, and #39 lead from the road	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Determining the final configuration of snowmobile opportunities in the final travel plan within the HPBH study area was very challenging. The preferred alternative would drop the snowmobile connector between Buffalo Horn and Tom Minor, but maintain snowmobile access to the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				and are closed to snowmobiles. The snow cover on trail #39, Teepee Creek, is rarely deep enough for skiing or snowshoeing; and should not be considered in any compilation of snow based opportunities. When snow is sufficient, trail #34, Porcupine Creek, it is especially suited for skiing.		between Buffalo Horn and Portal Creek on a designated trail in a closed area. This route was established well before the wilderness study area. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration for winter uses in the HPBH.
Tony Jewett and Tim Stevens	National Parks Conservation Association Northern Rockies Regional Office	1452	Helena	We request that the FS take steps to best secure this area just north of Yellowstone by eliminating all motorized use within the WSA by prohibiting motorcycle use there as well. This should include designation of the Gallatin Crest Trail, the Emerald Lake and Hyalite Lake trails, trails in the Porcupine Buffalo Horn area, and all other trails in the WSA as non-motorized. In addition to degrading wilderness character, the proposed motorcycle traffic would degrade grizzly bear habitat in the Grizzly Bear Primary Conservation Area just a few miles north of Yellowstone.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use (including snowmobiles) until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						opportunities within the HPBH.
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		Alternative 7 encourages motorcycle use on the Buffalo Horn Pass Trail #120. This is negligent forest management, and will cause tremendous harm to wildlife, recreational users, and private property owners in the area. If this trail is allowed to continue to be used by motorcycles, the land may be degraded to a point that the area no longer classifies as wilderness. Additionally, by allowing continued motorized use of the trail, Gallatin is building a constituency of motorized users who will actively oppose wilderness designation of the area. It is clearly time to prohibit ALL motorized use in this important wilderness study area.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use (including snowmobiles) until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		Trail #299, Gallatin Crest Upper Porcupine Creek, is labeled by number on the DEIS maps, but is not included in the summary tables. As it is a primary	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	Thank you for noting this omission. It was corrected in the FEIS. This trail would be managed as non-motorized in the preferred alternative 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				access trail to the Gallatin Crest, leaving it and Trail #96 open to motorized use guarantees that the trail will continue to get worse. It should also be closed to mountain bikes for these same reasons.		
Noreen Breeding		454		Teepee Creek Trail #39: Alternative 7 rightly proposes to close this trail which connects to YNP to motor vehicles. However, designating this as a ski trail in winter is ridiculous. There is never enough snow to cover the sagebrush and wintering elk there are better off left undisturbed.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	This trail would be managed for foot and stock travel in the preferred alternative. The ski trail designation in alternative 7 in the DEIS was a map error. The preferred alternative 7M drops this designation.
Roger Breeding		602	Bozeman	Tepee Creek trail #39. Alternative 7 rightly proposes to close this trail, which connects to Yellowstone National park, motor vehicles. However, designating this as a ski trail in Winter is ridiculous. There is rarely enough snow to cover the sagebrush here and the elk wintering there are better left undisturbed.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	This trail would be managed for foot and stock travel in the preferred alternative. The ski trail designation in alternative 7 in the DEIS was a map error. The preferred alternative 7M drops this designation.
Joe Gutkoski		120	Bozeman	Please exclude snowmobiles from the porcupine drainage. The B.S. trail runs through the most important wintering range.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	We understand your concern about snowmobiles in winter range. Determining the final configuration of snowmobile opportunities in the final travel plan within the HPBH study area was very challenging. The preferred alternative would drop the snowmobile connector between Buffalo Horn and Tom Minor, but maintain snowmobile access to the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail between Buffalo Horn and Portal Creek on a designated trail in a closed area. This route was established well before the wilderness study area. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration for winter uses in the HPBH.
James Brown		894	Livingston	Mitigation for motorized closures should be offered in the planning process. If an area is removed from snowmobiling opportunities or trails closed to motorized use, there should be an equal opportunity added to meet the needs of a growing recreational sport.	Process	We do not agree that providing "equal" recreation opportunities will necessarily lead to the best travel plan. Instead we believe providing a broad mix of opportunities that the resource is capable of supporting and which responds to social issues should be the desired future condition. The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests. This may not be an "equal" mix of opportunities in some locations. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Rita Rozier		30	Livingston	Roadless study areas should all be protected from change to motorized access for several reasons: 1 - motorized use favors many current users but in doing so forever ends a precious and limited wilderness; 2 - wilderness is necessary to survival of the wild character that supports endangered wildlife and the people whose sanity and well being relies upon it; 3 - True multiple-use is best served by reserving wilderness as a biological safe-zone for water, air, and land; 4 - it is unethical to pollute our environment for monetary gain.	Roadless, Wilderness, Recommended Wilderness	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests, including roadless lands in some areas. There is no higher lever agency policy that would prohibit us from allowing motorized uses in roadless lands. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Allowing motorized use on trails in these roadless areas destroys the roadless values. From the perspective of wildlife, motorized use in what fragments habitat, with no difference whether it is a road or a trail. The FS should prohibit motorized use in Roadless Areas. We oppose the construction of improvement of trails within IRAs and urge the FS to use its limited funds and resources in other areas.	Roadless, Wilderness, Recommended Wilderness	The Forest Service believes that both motorized and non-motorized use are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests, including roadless lands in some areas. There is no higher lever agency policy that would prohibit us from allowing motorized uses in roadless lands. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Linda Ellison		1070		On the issue of recommended wilderness areas, Congress has not designated these areas as Wilderness and given your own findings that none of the alternatives would cause irreversible or irretrievable effects to the characteristics that would negate future consideration of the Forest's many roadless areas for wilderness designation, the same applies here. Each recommended wilderness area should be managed on it's own merits with regard to motorized use.	Roadless, Wilderness, Recommended Wilderness	The preferred alternative would manage the Lionhead and Republic recommended wilderness areas for non-motorized uses. The Republic area is a steep trailless area that does not currently receive significant travel of any sort. The discussion for Lionhead was more challenging as this area is currently open to motorcycles, and receives some snowmobile traffic (albeit in a closed area). The preferred alternative would manage these areas to maintain their wilderness characteristics and future designation potential. Please see the Record of Decision for more discussion on rationale.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association	1440		Also, allowing uses in RWs that are not compatible with wilderness character, such as mountain biking and OHV use, creates a constituency that will fight	Roadless, Wilderness, Recommended	The preferred alternative would manage the Lionhead and Republic recommended wilderness areas for non-motorized uses. The Republic area is a steep trailless

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Madison-Gallatin Chapter			the logical outcome of the agency recommendations, i.e., the actual designation of the areas as Wilderness. We strongly urge the Forest Service to manage RWs as both motor free and bike free.	Wilderness	area that does not currently receive significant travel of any sort. The discussion for Lionhead was more challenging as this area is currently open to motorcycles, and receives some snowmobile traffic (albeit in a closed area). The preferred alternative would manage these areas to maintain their wilderness characteristics and future designation potential. The DEIS failed to consider an alternative that would prohibit mountain bikes in the Lionhead area. Therefore, alternative 7M does not propose to prohibit bikes at this time, however, revision of the plan in the near future may consider that option as displayed in alternative 6 of the FEIS. Please see the Record of Decision for more discussion on rationale.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		One of the National Strategic Goals regarding the use of motorized equipment in wilderness is to "Exclude the sight, sound, and other tangible evidence of motorized equipment or mechanical transport within wilderness, except where they are needed and justified." It is not clear whether this goal would be met in areas near the AB and Lee Metcalf Wilderness, Lionhead and Republic Mountain Recommended Wilderness, and HPBH-WSA. If there are likely impacts, the Forest should indicate whether motorized use that causes the impact is "needed and justified."	Roadless, Wilderness, Recommended Wilderness	The goal you refer to is specifically written to address designated wilderness. All alternatives would manage wilderness as non-motorized. The preferred alternative would manage the Lionhead and Republic recommended wilderness areas for non-motorized use to maintain their wilderness character. The Republic area is a steep trailless area that does not currently receive significant travel of any sort. The discussion for Lionhead was more challenging as this area is currently open to motorcycles, and receives some snowmobile traffic (albeit in a closed area). The preferred alternative would manage these areas to maintain their wilderness characteristics and future designation potential. A mix of motorized and non-motorized opportunities are proposed in the HPBH, which would maintain wilderness character circa 1977, and possibilities for future designation. Please see the Record of Decision and Decision Maps for additional rationale and a display of the final opportunities to be provided in theses areas.
Theodore Jefferson		8	White Sulphur Springs	When you close large areas to travel the risk of accidents, over use of fewer trails is greatly increased.	Safety	Thank you for your comment.
Judy and Ted Ward		991	Billings	Do not close Sec 6 (T5N R9E) from existing Smith Creek road (FR #991). This is a primary access for landowners and also a fire prevention and escape route. Proposed new trail T5N R10E, Sec 33 to Davy Butte. This trail is in prime elk habitat. It rides the ridge and is in a difficult area to make and maintain a new trail. Leave designated trails open for a certain time frame, i.e. 11a.m. to 3p.m. during	Shields	The travel plan preferred alternative for the Smith Creek area was revised to maintain 4x4 vehicle access in Section 6. Several ATV trail adjustments are recommended as well. Fine tuning the final configuration of open routes, and connections to the Lewis and Clark NF was challenging in this area. Please see the Detailed Description of the Decision, the Decision Maps and the Record of Decision for the final

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				hunting season for game retrieval.		configuration of routes in this area. The preferred alternative would not prohibit the use of motor vehicles off of designated routes for game retrieval, in sync with the Montana Dakota OHV Decision of 2001.
Andy Hopkins		930	Saratoga Springs UT	WSAs need to be maintained at uses prior to 1977. Snowmobiling in the Rock Creek and Hyalite areas has been going on since 1968. The lynx and wolverine studies have proven no ill effects on these two animals. These species are migratory and are hard to track and are seldom seen in the areas we snowmobile.	Snowmobiles	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use (including snowmobiles) until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		We urge you to change the dates of snowmobile use to Jan 1 - March 15. Allowing the season to last longer extends the snowmobile season into the spring when most damage to soils and emergent plants occurs due to thin or non-existent snow cover. Snowmobiles can do more damage than wheeled vehicles since they are not designed to travel on the ground and are often out when soils are wet and new plants are just emerging. In addition, shorter winters lately have rarely offered sufficient snow pack before the first of the year.	Snowmobiles	The preferred alternative identifies two sorts of snowmobile restrictions - yearlong closures, and seasonal restrictions. In areas where seasonal restrictions are proposed, snowmobiles would be prohibited between October 15 and December 2. This is to provide secure wildlife habitat during hunting season. There is no general start and end proposed to the snowmobile season for all other open areas in any alternative. Lack of snowcover in the spring and fall generally limits snowmobile travel now. Snowmobiles traveling on bare ground to the extent they cause resource damage are rare. Were this to occur, we have existing regulations that would allow us to cite those careless riders for resource destruction. Snowmobiles are prohibited by State law from traveling on plowed roads, and would be prohibited from traveling on groomed ski trails through the travel plan standards.
Shawn Regnerus	Defenders of Wildlife and Predator Conservation Alliance	1497	Bozeman	The FS should take the next logical step and limit snowmobiles to designated routes and play areas. The effects of snowmobiles and summer use are essentially the same. Snowmobiles disrupted the wildlife and other users in the same manner as ORVs but over a potentially greater area during a more critical season. Even the long-term effects of concentrated, repeated snow compaction are not dissimilar from the damage caused by cross-country use by wheeled vehicles. Other forests in the regions such as the Lewis and Clark and Helena have taken this step and it is time for the Gallatin to do the same.	Snowmobiles	No alternative in the travel plan considered in detail limiting snowmobiles to designated routes, unless that route passes through a closed area. We were unable to ascertain through our analysis that there were significant adverse effects identified at a forest-wide scale that would indicate that such blanket restrictions were necessary. Over-snow travel does not have the potential to cause soil and vegetation damage like off-route summer motorized travel can. In specific areas where snowmobile impacts can be of concern (e.g. windswept ridges, big game winter range, etc) we included area and seasonal restrictions within the range of alternatives considered in detail within the EIS. In response to comments that snowmobiling should be restricted to designated play areas, the alternatives studied in detail accomplish the converse of that. In other words they identified areas, otherwise suitable and attractive to snowmobilers, where that use would not be allowed due to a resource protection need. Other Region 1 Forests have not switched to a closed unless designated open system, but rather are employing the same methods we propose.
Todd C. Smith		1555	Livingston	The Bridgers (North at Ross Pass) and the Rock Creek area (south of Livingston) should remain open to snowmobiling. Closure at these two areas to snowmobiling would send users to other mountain	Snowmobiles	In the preferred Alternative 7M, areas on the east side of the Bridgers, and in the Rock Creek area south of Livingston would be open to snowmobiles. Please see the winter maps for Alternative 7M.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				rangers, like the crazies, creating a concentration problem.		
David Gaillard		303	Bozeman	In all areas of the Gallatin forest, snowmobiles should be considered OHVs and limited to designated routes and play areas only.	Snowmobiles	No alternative in the travel plan considered in detail limiting snowmobiles to designated routes, unless that route passes through a closed area. We were unable to ascertain through our analysis that there were significant adverse effects identified at a forest-wide scale that would indicate that such blanket restrictions were necessary. Over-snow travel does not have the potential to cause soil and vegetation damage like off-route summer motorized travel can. In specific areas where snowmobile impacts can be of concern (e.g. windswept ridges, big game winter range, etc) we included area and seasonal restrictions within the range of alternatives considered in detail within the EIS. In response to comments that snowmobiling should be restricted to designated play areas, the alternatives studied in detail accomplish the converse of that. In other words they identified areas, otherwise suitable and attractive to snowmobilers, where that use would not be allowed due to a resource protection need.
David Gaillard		303		The snowmobile season forest wide should mirror Bridger Bowl's ski season and close in early April, because of the high risk of damage during spring thaw to trails, streams, soils, and conflicts with grizzly bears and other wildlife.	Snowmobiles	The preferred alternative identifies two sorts of snowmobile restrictions - yearlong closures, and seasonal restrictions. In areas where seasonal restrictions are proposed, snowmobiles would be prohibited between October 15 and December 2. This is to provide secure wildlife habitat during hunting season. There is no general start and end proposed to the snowmobile season for all other open areas in any alternative. Lack of snow cover in the spring and fall generally limits snowmobile travel now. Snowmobiles traveling on bare ground to the extent they cause resource damage is rare. Were this to occur, we have existing regulations that would allow us to cite those careless riders for resource destruction. Snowmobiles are prohibited by State law from traveling on plowed roads, and would be prohibited from traveling on groomed ski trails through the travel plan standards.
Clinton Peterson	Mt. Hood Snowmobile Club	309	Oregon	The plan doesn't document any concrete evidence of any significant environmental damage or impacts in the areas being closed. What is the justification?	Snowmobiles	Chapter 3 of the EIS articulates where snowmobiling effects may cause resource concerns. Please see that discussion.
John A. Platt		322		Finally it would seem sensible to close snowmobiling season throughout the forest by April 1. Spring	Snowmobiles	The preferred alternative identifies two sorts of snowmobile restrictions - yearlong closures, and

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				conditions make the backcountry far more vulnerable to disruption and damage from snowmobile use.		seasonal restrictions. In areas where seasonal restrictions are proposed, snowmobiles would be prohibited between October 15 and December 2. This is to provide secure wildlife habitat during hunting season. There is no general start and end proposed to the snowmobile season for all other open areas in any alternative. Lack of snow cover in the spring and fall generally limits snowmobile travel now. Snowmobiles traveling on bare ground to the extent they cause resource damage are rare. Were this to occur, we have existing regulations that would allow us to cite those careless riders for resource destruction. Snowmobiles are prohibited by State law from traveling on plowed roads, and would be prohibited from traveling on groomed ski trails through the travel plan standards.
Todd Orr		1473		A few available areas commonly used by snowmobiles on the Gallatin, are experiencing extensive use. Parking space is extremely limited and non-existent if you get to the trailhead mid morning or later. Trails are being trenched and bumped out within a day of being groomed because of heavy use. Close-calls and near misses on narrow trails are more common with the increase in traffic and a life-threatening accident is inevitable in time. Reducing snowmobile play areas and access points will increase the concentration of use on these already busy areas. If wildlife protection is necessary then it seems possible that closures or restrictions for wildlife, could occur within a more localized and specific place of need, rather than vast area closures.	Snowmobiles	In the FEIS we considered public comment that the DEIS preferred alternative 7 was too restrictive in providing quality snowmobile opportunities, and may lead to additional congestion issues as you suggest in you comment. Alternative 7M modified the snowmobile closures suggested in the DEIS to provide better opportunities in the Bridgers and the Gallatin Range, while still protecting important resource values like winter wildlife habitat and providing non-motorized winter recreation opportunities. Please see the winter maps for Alternative 7M.
Craig S. Osterman		1473a	Belt	I invite you to take a closer look at SAWS by going to http://www.snowmobile-alliance.org. This site will explain what our mission is and what our goals are.	Snowmobiles	Thank you for your comment.
Alaina Lammer Knight		629		End snowmobiling season on the Gallatin Forest on April 1 rather than the proposed June 1 cut-off date. Snow is generally gone by April 1. Snowmobile use in marginally snow covered areas will damage the forest.	Snowmobiles	The preferred alternative identifies two sorts of snowmobile restrictions - yearlong closures, and seasonal restrictions. In areas where seasonal restrictions are proposed, snowmobiles would be prohibited between October 15 and December 2. This is to provide secure wildlife habitat during hunting season. There is no general start and end proposed to the snowmobile season for all other open areas in any alternative. Lack of snow cover in the spring and fall

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						generally limits snowmobile travel now. Snowmobiles traveling on bare ground to the extent they cause resource damage are rare. Were this to occur, we have existing regulations that would allow us to cite those careless riders for resource destruction. Snowmobiles are prohibited by State law from traveling on plowed roads, and would be prohibited from traveling on groomed ski trails through the travel plan standards.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		Proposed area-wide snowmobile closures are generally June 1 - December 1. This extends the snowmobile season far too long into the spring when most damage to soil and emergent plants occurs due to thin or non-existent snow cover. We support a snowmobile season in legally open terrain running from January 1 to March 31.	Snowmobiles	The preferred alternative identifies two sorts of snowmobile restrictions - yearlong closures, and seasonal restrictions. In areas where seasonal restrictions are proposed, snowmobiles would be prohibited between October 15 and December 2. This is to provide secure wildlife habitat during hunting season. There is no general start and end proposed to the snowmobile season for all other open areas in any alternative. Lack of snow cover in the spring and fall generally limits snowmobile travel now. Snowmobiles traveling on bare ground to the extent they cause resource damage are rare. Were this to occur, we have existing regulations that would allow us to cite those careless riders for resource destruction. Snowmobiles are prohibited by State law from traveling on plowed roads, and would be prohibited from traveling on groomed ski trails through the travel plan standards.
Stephen Hunts		559		All snowmobiling in the Gallatin Forest should end seasonally by April 1. This is a very reasonable proposal as the snow does not safely cover the forest floor any later than that. Without proper snow cover snowmobiles begin to damage trails.	Snowmobiles	The preferred alternative identifies two sorts of snowmobile restrictions - yearlong closures, and seasonal restrictions. In areas where seasonal restrictions are proposed, snowmobiles would be prohibited between October 15 and December 2. This is to provide secure wildlife habitat during hunting season. There is no general start and end proposed to the snowmobile season for all other open areas in any alternative. Lack of snow cover in the spring and fall generally limits snowmobile travel now. Snowmobiles traveling on bare ground to the extent they cause resource damage are rare. Were this to occur, we have existing regulations that would allow us to cite those careless riders for resource destruction. Snowmobiles are prohibited by State law from traveling on plowed roads, and would be prohibited from traveling on groomed ski trails through the travel plan standards.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		Snow in alpine areas is highly susceptible to wind movement which can leave bare or thinly covered areas that would be difficult or impossible to avoid given the speed of snowmobiles. Fragile alpine vegetation may need protection against such use. We suggest ending the snowmobiling season on the GNF on April 15 or May 1, rather than the proposed June 1 end date.	Snowmobiles	The preferred alternative identifies two sorts of snowmobile restrictions - yearlong closures, and seasonal restrictions. In areas where seasonal restrictions are proposed, snowmobiles would be prohibited between October 15 and December 2. This is to provide secure wildlife habitat during hunting season. There is no general start and end proposed to the snowmobile season for all other open areas in any alternative. Lack of snow cover in the spring and fall generally limits snowmobile travel now. Snowmobiles traveling on bare ground to the extent they cause resource damage are rare. Were this to occur, we have existing regulations that would allow us to cite those careless riders for resource destruction. Snowmobiles are prohibited by State law from traveling on plowed roads, and would be prohibited from traveling on groomed ski trails through the travel plan standards.
David Gaillard		303		The snowmobile season forest-wide should mirror Bridger Bowl's ski season and close in early April, because of the high risk of damage during spring thaw to trails, streams, soils, and conflicts with grizzly bears and other wildlife…).	Snowmobiles	The preferred alternative identifies two sorts of snowmobile restrictions - yearlong closures, and seasonal restrictions. In areas where seasonal restrictions are proposed, snowmobiles would be prohibited between October 15 and December 2. This is to provide secure wildlife habitat during hunting season. There is no general start and end proposed to the snowmobile season for all other open areas in any alternative. Lack of snow cover in the spring and fall generally limits snowmobile travel now. Snowmobiles traveling on bare ground to the extent they cause resource damage are rare. Were this to occur, we have existing regulations that would allow us to cite those careless riders for resource destruction. Snowmobiles are prohibited by State law from traveling on plowed roads, and would be prohibited from traveling on groomed ski trails through the travel plan standards.
John A. Platt		322		It would seem sensible to close snowmobiling season throughout the Forest by April 1. Spring conditions make the back country far more vulnerable to disruption and damage from snowmobile use.	Snowmobiles	The preferred alternative identifies two sorts of snowmobile restrictions - yearlong closures, and seasonal restrictions. In areas where seasonal restrictions are proposed, snowmobiles would be prohibited between October 15 and December 2. This is to provide secure wildlife habitat during hunting season. There is no general start and end proposed to the snowmobile season for all other open areas in any alternative. Lack of snow cover in the spring and fall

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						generally limits snowmobile travel now. Snowmobiles traveling on bare ground to the extent they cause resource damage are rare. Were this to occur, we have existing regulations that would allow us to cite those careless riders for resource destruction. Snowmobiles are prohibited by State law from traveling on plowed roads, and would be prohibited from traveling on groomed ski trails through the travel plan standards.
Noreen Breeding		454		To protect resources now and in the future, snowmobilers should be required to use BAT (Best Available Technology) machines that minimize noise and air pollution.	Snowmobiles	The State of Montana regulates snowmobile noise requirements, and the EPA regulates emissions. Regulating these facets of snowmobile technology is outside the scope of this decision.
Gayleen Malone		1775	Pray	Winterized motor recreation should not be considered with wheeled recreation. The impact is totally different. When the snow melts the tracks are gone. The area is not popular with quiet users due to the steep slopes and the challenging terrain.	Snowmobiles	The Forest Service believes that motorized use, including snowmobiling is a legitimate and appropriate use of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Jeffrey J. Holman		1859		Winter use in the Bridgers, Hyalite, and Windy Pass area. Why is this proposed course of action? These are very good hotspots for us locals to go without the crowds of rental sleds on other trail systems. The building of groomed trails in exchange for the high country bowls and meadows - that's not a very fair exchange. Where can we ride that has that level of riding the locals are looking for?	Snowmobiles	In response to comments from many snowmobilers, the proposed snowmobile restrictions depicted in alternative 7 of the DEIS were modified in the FEIS. The preferred alternative 7M would provide high quality snowmobiling opportunities in the Bridgers, and in a corridor from Windy Pass to Rock Creek. Please see the winter map for alternative 7M.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Closed-unless-open policy - This policy should be listed as a standard under Recreation and Public Use, in the section on Forest-wide Direction.	Standards and Guidelines	It is for summer motorized recreation uses. See Standard A-8 in the Detailed Description of the Alternatives.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Under Standard A-9, Snowmobile Prohibition on Ski Trails, why does this standard apply only to groomed ski trails? Marked ski trails should also be included. There are very few groomed ski trails; the majority of trails suitable for skiing are marked and unmarked trails and routes, which are seriously degraded by snowmobile tracks.	Standards and Guidelines	In certain areas, marked ski trails fall within open snowmobile areas where shared use is appropriate. In the FEIS alternative 7M we identified several marked ski trails where snowmobiles would be prohibited in otherwise open areas (see the winter map for a new symbol that indicates a marked route in an otherwise open area is closed to snowmobiles). Most of the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						proposed marked ski trails in alternative 7M fall within area closures to snowmobiles. Please see the winter map for alternative 7m.
Noreen Breeding		454		Standard A-6. Omit the word "motorized" so that the sentence reads, "Wheeled vehicle travel shall be prohibited off of designated routes…" In light of the current heavy and growing volume of mountain bicycle traffic, why are bicycles also not included in off route travel? They generally travel far and fast compared to pedestrians and horses.	Standards and Guidelines	Consideration was given to whether mountain bikes should be restricted to designated routes. Some parts of the country are incurring problems with off-route bike travel, but that is not currently the case on the Gallatin NF. Growth of mountain biking over time, and resulting resource or social effects may cause the Forest to have to consider additional mountain bike restrictions in the future.
Noreen Breeding		454		Standard A-9: Why are marked ski trails not also protected from snowmobile travel? There are very few groomed ski trails. The vast majority are marked and unmarked ski trails which cannot be used by skiers if they are torn up by snowmobiles.	Standards and Guidelines	In certain areas, marked ski trails fall within open snowmobile areas where shared use is appropriate. In the FEIS alternative 7M we identified several marked ski trails where snowmobiles would be prohibited in otherwise open areas (see the winter map for a new symbol that indicates a marked route in an otherwise open area is closed to snowmobiles). Most of the proposed marked ski trails in alternative 7M fall within area closures to snowmobiles. Please see the winter map for alternative 7m.
Linda Miller	Elkhorn Ranch	1433		The Cinnamon Creek Trail #6 has been getting increasing use in recent years and the trail shows it. The stream crossings are eroded in the spring and the trail braided as motorcycles and bicycles move off the wet uphill portions. This is also grizzly bear territory. Motorized travel should not be allowed on this trail. Motorized travel is also not appropriate on trails #30 and #63 as these trails dead end at trail #8 which is off limits for motorized use. This is also a jump off into the Lee Metcalf wilderness and an obvious enforcement problem.	Taylor Fork	These trails would be managed as open to motorcycles only from June 16 - December 1 in the preferred alternative. Alternative 6 considered the configuration you propose. Trail #8 would be open to motorcycles to Lizard Lakes in the preferred alternative, as it is today. Please see the 7M summer motorized map.
Pete Rugheimer		1520	Bozeman	Mini Wapiti Tr #203 & other trails in the area (205, 206) are slated to be open for M/C use on July 15 an close on September 15 - why these dates? Please open these trails open a month earlier and close a month later (June 15 - Oct. 15).	Taylor Fork	In the preferred alternative the Minnie Wapiti trail would be open to motorized travel from July 15 - Dec.2. This is an important ungulate calving area in the spring, and holds snow well into summer. These restrictions are designed to protect wildlife habitat and the trail facility.
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Cinnamon Trails 6 & 30 - Please move opening and closing dates to June 1 and Oct. 15th respectively.	Taylor Fork	In the preferred alternative the Cinnamon Trail would be managed as open to motorcycles from July 15 through December 2. This is an important ungulate calving area in the spring, and holds snow well into summer. These restrictions are designed to protect wildlife habitat and the trail facility.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Paul D. Herbel		1330		Cinnamon Basin needs all of those trails to open and close on the same dates. Again, for continuity and reduced confusion. I propose a 16 week season for all of it, June 15 - Oct. 15 providing the ground is dry. This would need to be monitored. I'd volunteer to do it.	Taylor Fork	In the preferred alternative the trails in Cinnamon Basin would be managed as open to motorcycles from July 15 through December 2. This is an important ungulate calving area in the spring, and holds snow well into summer. These restrictions are designed to protect wildlife habitat and the trail facility.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Dead Horse Creek Road 136 Segment One: the open dates on this section are too restrictive on a dry year. With the early fire restrictions motorized use would be almost eliminated. June 1 or 15th to October 1 or 15th will be more and acceptable.	Taylor Fork	In the preferred alternative 7M this section of the Dead Horse road would be open between July 1 and September 15. This restriction is designed to provide secure wildlife habitat and protect the road facility.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Oil Well Road Trail 68 Segment One and Two: opening and closing dates are to restrictive.	Taylor Fork	In the preferred alternative the Oil Well Road would be open to motorized travel from July 15 - Dec.2. This is an important ungulate calving area in the spring, and holds snow well into summer. These restrictions are designed to protect wildlife habitat and the trail facility.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Minnie Wapiti Trail 203: opening and closing dates are too restrictive. Please do not open to ATVs. And please don't close it to motorcycles north of Pika Point as this trail is one of the few remaining single tracks available to motorcycles in the Carrot Basin area.	Taylor Fork	In the preferred alternative the Minnie Wapiti trail would be open to motorized travel from July 15 - Dec.2. This is an important ungulate calving area in the spring, and holds snow well into summer. These restrictions are designed to protect wildlife habitat and the trail facility. This trail would be open to motorcycles in the preferred alternative north of Pika Point.
Kirk Hewitt		1334		Cabin Creek Divide 206: once again your opening and closing dates suck.	Taylor Fork	In the preferred alternative the Cabin Ck Divide trail would be open to motorized travel from July 15 - October 15. This is an important ungulate calving area in the spring, and holds snow well into summer. These restrictions are designed to protect wildlife habitat and the trail facility, and to provide non-motorized hunting opportunities during the big game season.
Linda Miller	Elkhorn Ranch	1433		We would ask that the Forest Service look into the logistics and feasibility of putting a groomed snowmobile trail in the vicinity of trail 71 (I say vicinity because and talking to a number of Forest Service people I have the impression that it is a concept with no specifics yet addressed). The existing trail is steep and tricky enough to discourage all the proficient snowmobilers and, therefore, will not be used as a substitute for Wapiti, which is more conducive to use by beginners and families (according to the snowmobilers I have talked to). There is also a growing number of cross country skiers using Sage Creek trailhead to access # 11	Taylor Fork	The preliminary feasibility study for this proposed relocation of the Big Sky Trail has been done, and the new route is feasible. We feel that this relocation will address moose winter range issues in the Taylor Fork as well as provide a safer snowmobile parking area, where folks no longer have to trailer down the unplowed Taylor Fork road.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				where they can take their dogs and this creates potential for another conflict of use.		
Pete Rugheimer		1520		Winter Use - Gallatin Crest - Adjustment of northern closure boundary to the Natural Terrain boundary around the Sentinel Mtn would virtually eliminate enforcement issues. Rock Creek access is the most important access to local Livingston Snowmobilers (more highly valued access). Snowmobilers support and will help fund establishment of a parking area on GNF property in the Rock Cr. Drainage.	Tom Miner Rock	Alternative 7M would allow snowmobile travel across Windy Pass, through to South Rock. Terrain boundaries were used to describe where closures would be employed. Please see the Record of Decision and Decision maps for the final configuration of snowmobile opportunities in the HPBH.
Gayleen Malone		1411	Pray	Rock and Tom Miner Creek areas: winterized motor recreation should not be considered with wheeled recreation. The impact is totally different. When the snow melts the tracks are gone. The area is not popular with quiet users due to the steep slopes and the challenging terrain.	Tom Miner Rock	Alternative 7M would allow snowmobile travel across Windy Pass, through to South Rock. Terrain boundaries were used to describe where closures would be employed. Please see the Record of Decision and Decision maps for the final configuration of snowmobile opportunities in the HPBH.
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		Prohibit all snowmachine use in the WSA, especially in Tom Miner Basin. The disturbance to wildlife in the area from snowmachine use is a problem. This area is high quality habitat, and should be managed as secure core. Snowmachines are also antithetical to the designation as a wilderness study area.	Tom Miner Rock	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use (including snowmobiles) until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Greg Gordon		640		I am also appalled by the proposal to designate the upper Tom Miner Basin as a snowmobile play area. Snowmobiles should be confined to designated roads and trails. Far too much of the GNF is open to free-rein snowmobiling, leaving very few areas for non-motorized winter users that are both accessible and quiet.	Tom Miner Rock	In the preferred alternative the upper elevations in Tom Minor Basin in the HPBH would be closed to snowmobiles. Please see the Alternative 7M winter map.
Scott Traucht		692	Emigrant	I am against the stock closures till 7/15 in the Tom Miner/Rock. The trails have not been hurt by early stock use by individuals.	Tom Miner Rock	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II in The Description of Alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		In order to minimize user conflicts the FS should provide sustainable user separation by creating areas, rather than just trails, that are available for non-motorized and motorized visitors alike. The obvious choices for non-motorized areas are the HPBH WSA, the Lionhead and Republic Rec. Wilderness areas, the Cabin Creek Recreation and Wildlife Management Area, IRAs and within the recovery zones for grizzly bear.	User Conflicts	The proposed travel plan preferred alternative does provide many "areas" that would be managed for non-motorized use by virtue of prohibiting motorized use off of designated routes, and grouping logical areas of non-motorized trails together. Please see the Alternative 7M summer motorized maps.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The e FS is considering the possibility of separating use by alternating days for use by motorized and non-motorized recreationists. We feel this approach to reducing user conflict is not a viable one. Establishing different days when motorized and non-motorized recreationists can use a trail is a set up for conflict. Which days or weeks or months each user group is allocated will always be a point of confusion, even if all users were from the local area. This will	User Conflicts	The preferred alternative is considering "time share" on a number of trails close to Bozeman. While we acknowledge that implementing this option will be challenging, we believe in time it will become second nature. Please see the Record of Decision for a more complete discussion on the decision relating to "time share" trails.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				be even more problematic if the separation is voluntary rather than mandatory.		
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		Time sharing of the trails will also do nothing to address resource problems caused by dirt bikes, ATVs and ORVs including wildlife disruption, habitat fragmentation, and spread of invasive weeds, water quality concerns and trail damage.	User Conflicts	The time share concept is largely designed to address social conflicts. Resource conflicts will be mitigated through seasonal restrictions, trail location and design, etc.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440	Bozeman	In general, OHV use is incompatible with wilderness character, wildlife and other ecological values, and with most other forms of recreation. The travel plan must take these facts of incompatibility and displacement into account and provide for separation of uses in a balanced way, an objective that has not been achieved in the draft plan, particularly in the WSA and in the West Bridgers Roadless Area.	User Conflicts	The Forest Service believes that motorized use, including snowmobiling is a legitimate and appropriate use of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		Another possibility for separating uses is by time-sharing of trails. The one recommendation along these lines in the draft plan, "voluntary" time-sharing of the East Hyalite Trail to Emerald Lake, would not be effective precisely because it would be voluntary. While the trails in the roadless areas should be completely motor free, a management option for a few trails that are able to withstand repeated motorized use would be to "zone" them by time sharing - but on a mandatory, not voluntary basis. Any time-share solutions proposed, however, must recognize that the vast majority of recreation use of Forest trails is non-motorized (e.g., time sharing between motorized and non-motorized travel on a 50% - 50% basis would be an equitable, fair, or balanced solution for non-motorized users.	User Conflicts	The time share concept is one we are considering in the final decision. If implemented, this would not be a voluntary option, but would be a mandatory exclusion of motorized use on certain trails during certain times of the open season. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.
Donald Mazzola		69	Bozeman	Close the W. Bridgers roadless area to motorcycles. These are hiking trails for families with steep slopes and erodable soils.	West Bridgers North	This proposal was considered in alternative 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, and Corbly). We are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Tim Preso		79	Bozeman	The west side of the Bridger Range should be closed to motorized use in the winter. While there may be little motorized use on the west side at this time, your decision on this travel plan will govern use of the Gallatin National Forest for many years, and this important area should be preserved for wildlife against possible future motorized incursions. This is especially important given the extensive human activity occurring on the east side of the Bridgers.	West Bridgers North	Alternative 5 considered managing the west side of the Bridgers as closed to snowmobiles. In the preferred alternative 7M some of the higher elevation basins would be managed as closed to snowmobiles to protect wolverine and mountain goat habitat. The Forest saw no need to limit snowmobiles otherwise, as terrain and low snow provides sufficient barriers to snowmobile use now.
Catherine Weeden		1604		As for snowmobiling on the west side north of Corbly Gulch, snowmobilers we have talked to recognize that closing this in Alt 7 appears to be a numbers game. The area does not have reliable snow and does not have open bowls, which snowmobilers like to play in. They are not interested in snowmobiling in the West Bridgers. More importantly, this should not be on paper, opening the door for this use.	West Bridgers North	Alternative 5 considered managing the west side of the Bridgers as closed to snowmobiles. In the preferred alternative 7M some of the higher elevation basins would be managed as closed to snowmobiles to protect wolverine and mountain goat habitat. The Forest saw no need to limit snowmobiles otherwise, as terrain and low snow provides sufficient barriers to snowmobile use now.
Kathryn Hiestand and Neal Miller		337		We are pleased that alternative seven excludes summer motorized use from north Cottonwood, but we would like to see snowmobiles excluded there as well. This canyon is so narrow for such a long time, and once the terrain opens up, the slopes are steep. This terrain does not lend itself to safe or easy travel for snowmobiles.	West Bridgers North	Alternative 5 considered managing the west side of the Bridgers as closed to snowmobiles. In the preferred alternative 7M some of the higher elevation basins would be managed as closed to snowmobiles to protect wolverine and mountain goat habitat. The Forest saw no need to limit snowmobiles otherwise, as terrain and low snow provides sufficient barriers to snowmobile use now.
Jonathan Langer	Natural Resources Defense Council	1453		We encourage the Gallatin to adopt the more stringent snowmachine standards from alternative 6, protecting 43% of the area from intense snowmachine use, as opposed to the 34% in Alternative 7. On the West side of the Bridgers, which is critical wolverine habitat, and highly prized as a non-motorized backcountry ski location, snowmachines should be restricted completely, or only permitted in already established play areas.	West Bridgers North	Alternative 5 considered managing the west side of the Bridgers as closed to snowmobiles. In the preferred alternative 7M some of the higher elevation basins would be managed as closed to snowmobiles to protect wolverine and mountain goat habitat. The Forest saw no need to limit snowmobiles otherwise, as terrain and low snow provides sufficient barriers to snowmobile use now.
Don Bachman		625		Trail bike use of the Sacajawea and Hardscrabble trail is inevitable under this travel prescription. This alternative will tempt skilled trail bikers to link with the Corbly Creek trail on the Bridger west side, also designed for motorcycles. It is just a matter of time before the ridge of Sacajawea will be despoiled by trail bikes, and the sloping alpine west side of this portion of the Bridger Range compromised. In addition to unacceptable user conflict, motorcycles	West Bridgers North	The Forest Service believes that motorized and non motorized use is a legitimate and appropriate use of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				will impact the mountain goat herd, disturb fragile and unique vegetation (in this alpine calcareous soil type) and create erosion runnels.		for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
Alan Oram		713		Due to the difficulty and distance for access to this area, I would advocate that snowmobile access be allowed on the road to the area to the South of Flathead Pass as this provides excellent skiing and access to the Northern end of the Bridgers. Some form of cooperation or identification of parking should be created with the landowners so no conflicts arise.	West Bridgers North	Alternative 7M proposes to manage a groomed snowmobile trail through Carroll Creek to Flathead Pass which would provide backcountry skiers access to this terrain. Please see the Alternative 7M winter map.
Kathryn Hiestand and Neal Miller		337		We are pleased that Alt 7 excludes summer motorized use from North Cottonwood, but we would like to see snowmobiles excluded there as well. This canyon is so narrow for such a long time, and once the terrain opens up, the slopes are steep. This terrain does not lend itself to safe or easy travel for snowmobiles.	West Bridgers North	Alternative 5 considered managing the west side of the Bridgers as closed to snowmobiles. In the preferred alternative 7M some of the higher elevation basins would be managed as closed to snowmobiles to protect wolverine and mountain goat habitat. The Forest saw no need to limit snowmobiles otherwise, as terrain and low snow provides sufficient barriers to snowmobile use now.
Doug Chabot		1229	Bozeman	I would like to see the Bridgers opened up to more snowmobiling than in Alt 7. Although the west side of the range is marked open for riding, in reality there is very little rideable terrain here. It all takes place on the east side.	West Bridgers North	Many snowmobilers commented to us that the preferred alternative identified in the DEIS was too restrictive on the east side of the Bridgers. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative has been reconfigured to provide more challenge snowmobile opportunities, while protecting important wildlife habitat and areas for backcountry skiing. Please see the 7M winter map.
Ted Lange		1094		Middle Cottonwood Trail (TR534) is a narrow trail with a lot of blind turns. Given the trails proximity to Bozeman and Belgrade and its heavy use by families, which will only continue to grow as these two cities grow, I believe this is not an appropriate trail for motorized use.	West Bridgers South	Alternative 7M does propose to allow motorcycles on Trail #534, north of Middle Cottonwood. The portion of this trail that runs south from Middle Cottonwood to the "M" would be managed for foot/stock/bicycle use only. Many people shared with us that they felt this trail for it's entire length should be managed for non-motorized use only - given it's heavy pedestrian traffic and "urban" feel now. Considering that input - we are including this route in a group of trails close to Bozeman where a "time share" use may be employed in the future. That is - that on certain days of the week, or some other configuration, this trail would be managed for foot and stock travel only. The preferred alternative identifies this proposal, but would not make the actual decision at this time. Instead, the Forest Supervisor would work with interested parties after implementation of the travel plan to develop a "time share" scenario that would be implemented at a later date.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Joe Gutkoski		120	Bozeman	Please designate the Corbly Gulch trail, Truman Gulch, Middle Cottonwood and the Foothill trail motor free. This designation would provide a block of quite land in the Bridgers.	West Bridgers South	This proposal was considered in alternatives 5 and 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, and Corbly). We are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.
Todd Smith		978	Livingston	The Bridgers and Rock Creek area should remain open to snowmobiling. Closure of these two areas to snowmobiling would send users to other mtn ranges creating a concentration problem.	West Bridgers South	The preferred alternative would provide snowmobiling opportunities in the Bridgers and in Rock Creek. Please see the winter map for alternative 7M.
Catherine Weeden		1604	Bozeman	Alternative 7 recommends motorcycle use along the middle trails of the West Bridgers. If these West Bridgers trails are also open to motors, there is no place for quiet opportunities in the Bridgers, a popular and close destination for the many Gallatin Valley area hikers.	West Bridgers South	This proposal was considered in alternatives 5 and 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, and Corbly). We are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.
Betsy Buffington and Janice Thomson	The Wilderness Society	1617		The Wilderness Society urges the FS to consider managing the entire west side, including the crest of the Bridgers as non-motorized. The Bridgers are one of the most popular hiking areas near Bozeman. People hike, run, walk with their families and wander with their dogs throughout this range in all kinds of weather and at all times of the day. Given the expectations for growth in the valley and increasing demand for easily accessible non-motorized recreational opportunities reflected in the DEIS, the agency should plan for that future by ending all motorized use on the west side.	West Bridgers South	This proposal was considered in alternatives 5 and 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, and Corbly). We are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.
John A. Platt		322		closer to home, the Bridger range provide some of the most accessible hiking terrain for Bozeman residents, as well as a rather vulnerable band of importance wildlife habitat, and should not be designated as an area where motorized visitors can have the freehand.	West Bridgers South	This proposal was considered in alternatives 5 and 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, and Corbly). We are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Greg Beardslee		737		The lower M. trail: this is where bicyclists will have to walk their bikes until past the Foothills Trail Junction. I cannot comply. Currently, I have a physical disability that prevents me from walking that far. Can I get a handicapped tag? Maybe there will be a way to accommodate bikers on their own parallel trail someday. Sypes Canyon to the M. is a great loop trail, and to have to walk their bikes after riding such a hair -- raising trail is almost an insult. How about some education signage for the hikers and bikers?	West Bridgers South	In the preferred alternative, having bikers walk their bikes from the M trail junction with the Bridger Foothills trails would be a voluntary educational management tool. The Forest is considering the concept of a parallel trail for bikes, but that proposal is not included at this time.
David Bechberger		738	Bozeman	I understand the concerns about mountain biking on the College M. trail. My concern is that prohibiting mountain bikes on this trail will prohibit some popular mountain biking routes such as the loop ride from Sypes Canyon (531) to the M. trail (511 -- 13) via the Bridger Mountains National Recreation Trail (534). I see two other possible solutions that would limit the confrontations between bikers and hikers while still allow both uses. My preferred alternative is to create a single track trail that follows at or near the fence line and allow bikers on that newly created trail only. The second alternative that I see is to allow bikers on only odd or even days.	West Bridgers South	In the preferred alternative, bikers would be allowed on the Bridger Foothills trail where it leave the "M" parking lot heading north to Sypes Canyon, but not on the steeper sections of trail that actually lead to the "M" monument. The Forest is considering the concept of a parallel trail for bikes, but that proposal is not included at this time. We are also considering the concept of "time share" for mountain bikes on these Bridger Foothills to Sypes canyon trail, where at certain times mountain bikes would be prohibited on these trails. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion on "time share" trails.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We strongly recommend motor-free management of the West Bridger trails that the preferred alternative proposes as open to motorcyles, i.e. Corbly Gulch Trail #544, Truman Gulch Trail #535, Middle Cottonwood Trail #586 and the portions of the Foothills Trail #534 connecting them. Under the proposal, motorcycle, mountain bike stock and foot use would be emphasized from mid-July through early September; this combination of uses on popular trails would create dangerous user conflicts and safety problems. The trails are steep, narrow, rocky, and easily eroded. In many places it is difficult to get off-trail quickly to avoid other users, particularly OHV riders descending rapidly. In addition, if motorized use is allowed on any of these trails, it will open all others to motorized trespass; motorcyclists can easily continue north or south on the Foothills trail to other Westside trails or up to and along the ridge. Enforcement would be extremely difficult.	West Bridgers South	This proposal was considered in alternatives 5 and 6. In the preferred alternative 7M, several trails in the West Bridgers would be managed as open to motorcycles (Middle Cottonwood, Truman, and Corbly). We are considering a "time share" concept on these trails in the final decision where at certain times during the open season motorized and mechanized use would be prohibited. Please see the Record of Decision for the final discussion and decision on time share trails.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Sara Goulden		1757		Require that dogs be leashed on some heavily used trails to protect wildlife and water quality. In July 2005 I witnessed the aftermath of a dog attacking a fawn. The dog was not on a leash or under owner control. I have seen other dogs harassing wildlife on this trail at other times.	West Bridgers South	Requiring that dogs be leashed on national forest is outside the scope of this decision.
Loren Blanksma		1194		There is currently a large non-motorized area (entire southeast side, Fairy Lake/Sacajawea Peak area, Bridger Ridge trail that is inaccessible to motorcycles), in addition to the proposed closures (North Cottonwood, the M to Middle Cottonwood Foothills Trail, and Sypes Canyon) that should provide a balance well in favor of non-motorized.	West Bridgers South	The Forest Service believes that motorized and non motorized use is a legitimate and appropriate use of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
David Summerfield		858	Bozeman	Sypes Canyon also has another issue. Alt 7 mentions the restriction of hiking between April and June. I'm not sure why. Facing south, this canyon is one of the first to open up snow-wise in the spring. Yes, there is often ice, but it too melts off before other trail systems.	West Bridgers South	No alternative proposes to restrict hiking at any time of the year.
Jan Young		172	Bozeman	Even though some trails are non-motorized they will be used because of easy access to the Bridger Mountain Trail. If you can get up one way you will come down any trail that looks good. As population increases in the valley, the lure of close mountains make people want to go there because of convenience and the thrill of steep areas. This will just create more trails, deeper the ruts, increase noise, scare away the wonderful wildlife, etc.	West Bridgers South	The Forest Service believes that motorized and non motorized use is a legitimate and appropriate use of the national forests. The travel planning process was designed to analyze the effects of all modes of travel, compare the relative merits and trade-offs of reasonable alternatives and ultimately determine where the opportunities for those uses could be provided. The Record of Decision documents the Forest Supervisor's conclusions about the various issues and the rationale for making her choice for a Travel Management Plan.
George Kamps		937	Livingston	Most of the trails on the east and west side of the Yellowstone River south of Livingston are proposed to be closed to the use of stock in the spring until June 15th. I totally disagree w/ any of these spring closures. Damage during high moisture periods is far greater during summer and fall when use is considerably higher. These closures would cut the riding season in half for many of us that enjoy getting out early in the year. Bear season opens 4/15 and closes either 5/31 or 6/15. These new proposals would really limit where a person could hunt.	Yellowstone	In response to many comments from stock users, alternative 7M would remove the "blanket" spring restrictions to stock use, and instead identifies a small number of specific routes where spring stock use would be restricted to protect facilities. See chapter II in The Description of Alternatives for a detailed listing of these routes.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Extended overnight camping hunts would be eliminated.		
Thomas B. Wells		553		Goal 4: It is critical that this area be managed for wilderness character meaning the elimination of motorized use from the area including enabling winter access without snowmobiles. These are the primary access routes to the Crest from the middle of the East side so they are key to the potential for quiet outings as access is improved.	Yellowstone	The Montana Wilderness Study Act (S. 393) mandates that the Agency maintain "presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System" in the HPBH WSA. Nothing in the Act addresses specific uses (or the amount of use) that was occurring at the time, nor mandates the Agency to manage for a particular use. Congress was clear that they did not intend the Forest Service to automatically exclude existing ORV use (including snowmobiles) until appropriate designation was decided. However, use could be adjusted or modified by managers through travel planning to meet resource or recreation objectives that did not diminish the integrity of the Wilderness Study Area (see the Congressional Record 95-620 page 4). Judge Molloy (in his ruling in MWA vs. the United States) also found that WSA's do not have to be administered exactly as they were in 1977 to be consistent with the Act, so long as changes don't undermine the area's potential for wilderness designation or presently existing (1977) wilderness character. The Gallatin Forest Plan of 1987 did not recommend the HPBH for wilderness designation, rather directs that a variety of motorized and non-motorized dispersed recreation activities be provided. Alternative 7M the preferred alternative proposes a variety of motorized/mechanized and non-motorized opportunities in the summer and winter (see the summer motorized and winter maps) which would not allow the accretion of motorized use across all areas within HPBH, preserving large portions of the study area for primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities. This alternative would maintain or improve wilderness character circa 1977. Please see Chapter 3, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas discussion for comprehensive discussion on effects of various alternatives. Please see the Record of Decision and the Decision Maps for the final configuration of recreation opportunities within the HPBH.
Chuck Jarecki		263	Polson	At the present time, all recreation airstrips located on Montana USFS lands are in northwest Montana. It would be desirable at this stage in your planning	Airplanes	The Preferred Alternative would allow for establishing airstrips on the National Forest. Please see objective A-6 in the Detailed Description of the Alternatives. The

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				process to give serious consideration to the establishment of other airstrips in other parts of Montana's National Forest system. Considering the vast number of acres in the Gallatin National Forest and the hundreds of miles of roads and trails, there must surely be room to accommodate a small number of airstrips for a different segment of the recreating public that just happens to have an alternative mode of transportation.		Preferred Alternative would not identify where airstrips could be allowed. However, the Preferred Alternative would preclude any proposals in Wilderness Areas, in the HPBH Study Area, in recommended wilderness areas, and within Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone.
John McKenna and Mike Sidders	Montana Pilots Association	764		As the lowest impact motorized the user in the forest system, we contend that airstrips should be considered wherever other motorized use is already in existence. We feel as though there has been little done to understand our desires as well as understand the negligible impact that aircraft have on the resource.	Airplanes	The Final EIS and preferred alternative does take into account the input received from backcountry airstrip advocates. An effects analysis was done for the areas that were suggested as desirable landing areas. The result of that analysis and other input from recreational backcountry pilots was that the Preferred Alternative would include Objective A-6 which allows for a process to consider proposals to authorize locations for landings and takeoff of backcountry aircraft.
John McKenna and Mike Sidders	Montana Pilots Association	764		In your response to our proposal, you indicate that those within the Main Boulder have low potential because air ceilings would be exceeded. We would like to take this opportunity to point out that there are no over flight restrictions on designated wilderness areas. Pilots are requested to minimize their time spent low over wilderness areas as a courtesy. It is not contained within the Federal aviation regulations so this argument is without merit.	Airplanes	The analysis showed that the biggest drawback for the Main Boulder as a landing site, especially the Box Canyon site that was recommended by the backcountry pilots, was the cramped quarters in an area that was used by other recreationists. The possible landing strip itself did not appear to be adequate because of the timber and the nearness to the corral site.
John McKenna and Mike Sidders	Montana Pilots Association	764		The Bishop Park area is also indicated by you to have a low potential because it is being considered for a special interest area and long-term native grass study. We feel this area of would be an exceptional opportunity to show that aircraft use has minimal impact on native grasses. In fact, it would be difficult to ascertain the viability of native grasses without subjecting them to recreational uses.	Airplanes	Bishop Park area in the Bangtails is being considered as a Research Natural Area. The purpose of designating an RNA is to allow only natural processes to occur on certain rare or representative habitats. This did not seem to be compatible with designating that particular area for a landing strip. Other proposed areas in the Bangtails would be considered in a site specific special use request.
John McKenna and Mike Sidders	Montana Pilots Association	764		The Bangtail's were also felt to have low potential because they are being considered as a resource natural area. With flat, grassy meadows interspersed with Douglas fir, this would again be an ideal site for a recreational airstrip. The Bangtail's have historically seen extensive logging activity with miles of logging roads. This would be an excellent opportunity to show the public that the forest can be	Airplanes	Bishop Park area in the Bangtails is being considered as a Research Natural Area. The purpose of designating an RNA is to allow only natural processes to occur on certain rare or representative habitats. This did not seem to be compatible with designating that particular area for a landing strip. Other proposed areas in the Bangtails would be considered in a site specific special use request.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				accessed with minimal impact and without ongoing maintenance of existing roads.		
Pat Flowers	Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	1438		Backcountry Airstrips: we understand there would be a more formal process before any airstrips are constructed, but at this time, we see no benefit to creating backcountry airstrips on locations such as Horse Butte and the South Plateau areas near West Yellowstone. There are obvious wildlife concerns relating to these types of sites. In addition, both of these particular areas are within a few air miles of an existing airport at West Yellowstone.	Airplanes	The Travel Plan Decision has, as part of its objectives, the consideration of future landing strips. Objective A-6 contains direction that proposals for these uses would not be considered in the Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone. Both Horse Butte and South Plateau are in the recovery zone so no proposal would be considered there.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		We would like to express our opposition to construction of landing strips in roadless areas. The Gallatin Forest is already heavily used by outfitters as well as by individuals. Providing yet another means of access will overburden the carrying capacity of the land. Also, in order to land on these strips, airplanes will have to fly low over neighboring wilderness, roadless areas, and private land, disturbing the quiet and destroying the feeling of solitude.	Airplanes	Any future backcountry landing strip on the National Forest will undergo an independent NEPA analysis to determine the appropriateness and the environmental effects of that action. The decision would be made with public input.
Greg Gordon		640	Cascade	The proposed landing strips in the travel plan serve no real need nor purpose and would only benefit a few select individuals at public expense while impacting all other users and wildlife. For example, the proposed strip at Horse Butte would disrupt bison and nesting bald eagles and possibly swans.	Airplanes	There would be no landing strip at Horse Butte in the Preferred Alternative 7M. Objective A-6 proposes a restriction on considering landing strips in the Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone. However the same objective allows for consideration of landing strip proposals in other parts of the National Forest.
Dan F. Nelson		1763		Please consider all airports that are within your forest area and consider them as valuable resources that may be easily discounted, but would be difficult, if not impossible to re-create.	Airplanes	The Gallatin NF presently has no landing strips except for the West Yellowstone airport which is a sanctioned airport. Objective A-6 of the Travel Plan Decision would allow for consideration of backcountry landing strips in parts of the National Forest.
Thomas B. Forbes		1767	Washington	I strongly encourage the USFS to consider adding at least one turf airstrip within each of the ranger districts being considered for wilderness designation (Bozeman RD, Gardiner RD, Hebgen Lake RD, and Big Timber RD) for some of the following reasons: Such facilities greatly increase access to the wilderness by the public; Such airstrips are useful for firefighting, search and rescue and re-supply of ranger stations; Objection to air strips in areas already accessible by road is based on personal prejudice rather than scientific merit; Most airstrips	Airplanes	Upon consideration of including backcountry landing strips as part of the Gallatin Travel Plan EIS, the Preferred Alternative would not to allow consideration of these landing strips in designated and recommended wilderness or in the HPBH Study Area based upon the effects of this use on the wilderness character of the areas. However, the Preferred Alternative would allow for consideration of landing strips in other areas of the Forest.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				are sited on level or nearly level ground - such as a river flood plain or meadow; According to the Idaho Pilots Association, there have been no cases where the USFS has been sued as a result of an aviation accident involving a private pilot-thus liability is a non-issue; and Maintenance costs are minimal.		
Andrew V. Cebula	Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association	1870	Maryland	There is no mention in the preferred alternative to improve or maintain access for aircraft. Information regarding backcountry landing strips is included n Alt 3 but aviation is not addressed in Alt 7. The benefits from aviation are nearly limitless and should be addressed in this travel management plan. AOPA strongly encourages the FS to include backcountry landing strip objectives in the Gallatin Forest Travel Management Plan.	Airplanes	Backcountry landing strips were initially addressed in the Travel Plan DEIS in Alternative 3. In the Final EIS Preferred Alternative 7M, consideration to authorize locations for landing strips would be included in Objective A-6. This objectives would allow for proposals for landing strips with some direction where they would not be considered such as designated and recommended wilderness, wilderness study areas, and in the Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone. Any proposal that were approved would be regulated by special use authorization.
Felix F. Moran		1914	Polson	The benefits provided by the development of airstrips within the forest include: A means for disabled persons to reach remote sites when they cannot endure a long overland journey; Use as a natural base for search, rescue and fire fighting efforts; Serving as emergency landing sites for over-flying aircraft.	Airplanes	These characteristics could be considered when a proposal for a landing strip on the National Forest is brought forward.
	Montana Pilots Association	764	Bozeman	As the lowest impact motorized user in the forest system, we contend that airstrips should be considered wherever other motorized use is already in existence. This was taken into consideration when we originally submitted our proposal and we made every attempt to select areas which were already impacted by other motorized use. We feel we have made every effort to be cooperative, non-confrontational, and partners in the plan. We feel as though there has been little done to understand our desires as well as understand the negligible impact that aircraft have on the resource. ...you indicate that those within the Main Boulder have low potential because air celings would be exceeded. We would like to take this opportunity to point out that there are no over flight restrictions on designated wilderness areas. Pilots are requested to minimize their time spent low over wilderness areas as a courtesy. It is not contained within the Federal Aviation	Airplanes	We appreciate the effort and the willingness of the Montana Pilots Association to work in a positive way with the Gallatin National Forest, just as many interest groups from around the region have, and to provide us with the information you have. The analysis showed that the biggest drawback for the Main Boulder as a landing site, especially the Box Canyon site that was recommended by the backcountry pilots, was the cramped quarters in an area that was used by other recreationists. The possible landing strip itself did not appear to be adequate because of the timber and the nearness to the corral site. Bishop Park area in the Bangtails is being considered as a Research Natural Area. The purpose of designating an RNA is to allow only natural processes to occur on certain rare or representative habitats. This did not seem to be compatible with designating that particular area for a landing strip. Other proposed areas in the

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Regulations so this argument is without merit. The Bishop Park area is also indicated by you to have low potential because it is being "considered" for a Special Interest Area and long term native grass study. We feel this area would be an exceptional opportunity to show that aircraft use has minimal impact on native grasses. In fact, it would be difficult to ascertain the viability of native grasses without subjecting them to recreational uses. There are no public, backcountry airstrips in southwest Montana. Why? No good excuse has ever been offered by any District Ranger.		Bangtails would be considered in a site specific special use request.
	Montana Pilots Association	764	Bozeman	…the Bangtails…this would again be an ideal site for a recreational airstrip. …forest can be accessed with minimal impact and without ongoing maintenance of existing roads.	Bangtails	Bishop Park area in the Bangtails is being considered as a Research Natural Area. The purpose of designating an RNA is to allow only natural processes to occur on certain rare or representative habitats. This did not seem to be compatible with designating that particular area for a landing strip. Other proposed areas in the Bangtails would be considered in a site specific special use request.
Alfred McGuire		25		I had a good visit with Jim Devitt. He explained a lot of stuff to me I never realized. He is a good man.	Colorful	Thank you for your comment.
Rick D Sommers		596	Bozeman	My life and business centers on ATV's, snowmobiles, jeeps, motorcycles, any vehicle that burns gas but the issue was not addressed as how the proposed alternative will effect the economy here, not just my economy but the entire community. This community is entirely dependent on tourism and the major tourism in our area is motorized vehicles.	Cooke City	We agreed with respondents who said the economic analysis that appeared in the DEIS was inadequate and, therefore, we produced an Expanded Social Economic Analysis and made that available to the public for comment before beginning work on the Final EIS. This work used the most current economic and demographic information available. We showed the overall regional and local effects of recreation occurring on the Gallatin National Forest. We recognized that effects in recreation dependent towns like Cooke City and West Yellowstone were much greater than they were for the rest of the locality and region and this was considered in the decision that was made for these communities.
James Brown		894	Livingston	Table 29 (Economic Impact Study) lists expenditures per visit for a non-local x-c skier at $108.70, while listings costs for non-local snowmobiling at $77.41. We question why the x-c skier expenditure is more per visit.	Document	This information was taken directly from Styles, Daniel J. and White, Eric M. 2004Spending Profiles of National Forest Visitors, 2002 Update. USDA Forest Service Joint Venture Agreement.
Marty Malone		1025	Pray	IMPLAN: there are some concerns from other economists about the use of the economic forecasts. They chose not to use the US Fish and Wildlife study	Document	IMPLAN is a national industry standard for estimating economic effects of various activities or inputs such as recreation use. It is not clear what Fish and Wildlife

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				in their economic analysis. This national study showed significantly different numbers for the various types of recreation. The travel plan document states that 8,000 seeds were found on one vehicle. This was considered in the study. The wording in the document is extremely misleading to the public and should be altered to show the true conclusion of the study.		study is being referred to.
Lawrence McQuigg		1029	Flushing MI	Chart 29 of the Expanded Social Economic Analysis is flawed. It lists a non-local x-c skier as spending $108.70/day and a non-local snowmobiler spending $77.41/day. The cost to rent a snowmobile for a non-local will range from $90 - $160/day. With the add lodging, food, fuel and entertainment.	Document	This information was taken directly from Styles, Daniel J. and White, Eric M. 2004Spending Profiles of National Forest Visitors, 2002 Update. USDA Forest Service Joint Venture Agreement.
Sherry Dickelison	Big Boys Toys	4	Bozeman	The Gallatin Valley and surrounding area needs tourism to help the economy. It creates jobs and higher salaries. There is a need for all trails to remain open. The Gallatin Valley needs motorized vehicle tails so that Montana and it's residents and the economy can survive and grow.	Economics	The economic impact analysis conducted addressed the jobs and labor income effects stemming from the motorized and nonmotorized use on the Gallatin National Forest.
Liz Jackson		21		There are many economic issues that alternatives 3-7 have not addressed as to how much the communities of Cooke City, Gardiner, West Yellowstone & Silver Gate depend on tourists coming here.	Economics	The economic impact analysis conducted for the Gallatin travel plan addressed the issues raised during the scoping process. The main issue was the economic impacts of motorized and nonmotorized use on the Gallatin National Forest. The economic analysis conducted addressed the issue.
Jason and Suzanne Hahn	Elk Horn Lodge	54	Bozeman	Tourism was included in Chapter 4 due to the fact that it was determined not to be significant. Tourism may not be significant in regards to the entire GNF, but for the CC TPA, tourism is critical. The information is a generalization based upon tourism in Montana as a whole and one person's exit poll of visitors to Yellowstone National Park. None of which are specific to the GNF or any specific TPA.	Economics	The Expanded Social Economic Analysis does in fact include tourism and the entire service sector of the economy for the Gallatin National Forest region. The Travel Plan EIS did not consider tourism as a significant issue for the EIS simply because it was not a factor in developing alternatives and the effects of the alternatives would not be seen and could not be measured for tourism.
Jason and Suzanne Hahn		54		Economics, Issue 5, if analyzed with as much vigor as that of the grizzly, wolf, lynx, or cutthroat trout, would contribute to the goals, objectives, standard and guidelines for the Cooke City Travel Planning Area.	Economics	The economic analysis used to address the economic impact issues raised were based on 1) peer-review methods, and 2) statistically sampled visitor use and expenditure data. The literature cited for each of these items were provided in the DEIS.
Linda Ellison		1070		The Extended Economic Analysis has deemed the management of travel and recreation on the National Forest to have "a relatively small effect…,"which as a former dealer, I feel is a myth. The lack of data by	Economics	Scientifically based economic and visitor data was used to address the economic effects stemming from motorized and nonmotorized use for the Gallatin Travel Plan. The sources of the data are cited in the DEIS.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				which to characterize visitor use allows managers to perpetuate that same sort of myth with regard to potential compromises that could allow continued motorized use on specific trails within the management plan.		
Marty Malone		708	Pray	I noticed that they chose not to use the US Fish and Wildlife study in their economic analysis. This national study showed significantly different numbers for the various types of recreation. As I read the economic numbers from the plan they state that "non-local driving for pleasure" only adds $178,265 to the economy. This is an area where 1.4 million people visit Yellowstone National Park. If my calculations are correct that means that each non-local person only contributes less than 12 cents each to the economy. Something is not right. They are obviously making some assumptions as to the number of users of FS property and not including all visitors to the area. In 2003, 32,010 snowmobile visitors entered the Park. The great majority of these would be classified as non-local users. The economic data states that $178,000 was contributed to the economy for the entire forest. If we use this number divided by just the number of visitors to the Park, according to your economists each person would provide 23.00 to the economy. Everyone knows that number if faulty. I still feel that an independent economic study needs to be done.	Economics	The US Fish and Wildlife study was not used for this analysis since it applies to all land ownerships (public and private) in Montana. The economic analysis conducted for the Gallatin Travel Plan was based on use and expenditure data directly from the Gallatin National Forest, not Yellowstone NP or other ownerships. Use and expenditure data from these other ownerships are not relevant to the Gallatin National Forest.
Marty Malone		708		This approach used by IMPLAN to generate Type III multipliers could, however, overestimate multipliers on industry sectors from which tourists will typically buy goods. In other words, it assumes all the new population would have the same spending patterns regardless of if they were generated by high or low income jobs. This assumption will overestimate multipliers if the industry's employees are low in salaries and wages, or are part-time and seasonal workers. Because most tourism related industries pay below average wage and salaries or hire many seasonal and part-time workers, using IMPLAN Type III multipliers would significantly overestimate the resulting impacts on a region.	Economics	IMPLAN version 2.0 does not calculate a Type III multiplier. The Type II multiplier used for this analysis is not a function of population, but rather a function of resident only income (IMPLAN Professional Version 2 manual, page 15). The use of the Type II multiplier will avoid the overestimated induced effects that are referred to.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Sara Jane Johnson	Native Ecosystems Council	353		Your analysis fails to address the economic costs of a lack of specific limits to resource damage that will be caused by the various or preferred alternative. It is difficult for the reader to understand what the rationale was for the selection of various travel planning options for the travel planning areas because the economic impacts, such as reduced wildlife populations (bull elk, lynx, grizzly bears), increased sediment into streams, road and trail management costs, enforcement costs, etc., were never addressed, including for the current situation.	Economics	The economic impact analysis was based on current visitor motorized and nonmotorized use to the Gallatin National Forest. It did not address the economic impact of changes in 1) wildlife populations, 2) stream sedimentation. It also did not conduct a cost analysis related to changes in law enforcement.
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness Society	1882		In practice, the travel planning process is made up of a number of choices, each of which will be subject to competing judgments of value. The principal aim of any argument made by this accounting should suggest that the total value of a decision is preferred to that of its alternative - in this case that the total derived social, ecological, anew economic value of limiting motorized recreation on national forests exceeds the total value of allowing such use. Unfortunately, our ability to measure "total value" is limited, as there are many non market and non-use environmental goods. That said, the economic decision making process can help inform environmental decisions.	Economics	The "total value" was not measured. The economic impact analysis measures the economic effects (e.g., employment and labor income) stemming from the use of the Gallatin National Forest.
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness Society	1882		We suggest that the following benefits be measured to evaluate the economic value of public land: direct use benefits, such as recreation; community benefits, such as new residents or businesses attracted to the area; scientific benefits, such as research and education; off-site benefits, such as increased property values; biodiversity conservation; ecological services, such as watershed protection; and passive use benefits, such as the value of conserving wild lands for future generations. Weighing different recreation decisions (i.e. each of the proposed alternatives in the DEIS) based on their respective impact to these benefits would provide decision-makers with another tool to help choose among the aggregate benefits of each alternative.	Economics	The economic impact analysis conducted addressed the "benefits" to the local economy of the visitor use attributable to the Gallatin National Forest. The economic value tied to biodiversity, ecological services, etc. is not part of the economic impact analysis conducted.
Russ Ehnes	MTVRA	837		To predict weather management changes in the travel plan would change use figures, information should have been included on the snowmobile use in	Economics	Current visitor use information was used in this analysis. Predicting visitor use based on future weather patterns is outside of the scope of this analysis.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				Yellowstone Park and the City of West Yellowstone.		
Kerry White		1616		Windy Pass down into the many drainages of Big Creek is snowmobile heaven. This is a good snowmobile area to keep open. You can only go so far down Big Creek before it gets to steep or the creeks get to narrow. The elk winter above the Castle Rock down low so we aren't anywhere close to them. Gallatin County has identified trail numbers 83, 194, 179, 66, 82, 177, 166, 420, 96, 196, 187, and 159 as open to motorized and should be kept that way.	HPBH WSA	The Windy Pass area would be open to snowmobile use in the Preferred Alternative 7M. Not all trails in the HPBH which were previously open to motorcycle use would be designated open in the Travel Plan Decision. The Gallatin County trails plan did not make decisions on Gallatin National Forest routes. The Forest Service has jurisdiction and management responsibility for all National Forest System trails and roads on the Gallatin National Forest. The Forest Service has no information or evidence to indicate that Gallatin County has asserted rights to the trails you note in your comment or to any other National Forest System trail or road on the Gallatin National Forest.
Ken Zahn		1634		It is important to summarize what acreage access restrictions have been imposed by the 2000 Roadless Rule as well as the adoption of the OHV-1 restrictions in 2001 and then summarizing that level of additional restrictions in acreage access. This additional detail is important to portray since June 24th, 2005 guidance from the Counsel on Environmental Quality has reminded federal agencies of their obligation to analyze cumulative impacts in such a way as to better account for the role of the effects of past actions in setting a baseline for the impacts projected as a result of the proposed action.	Issues	The FEIS contains a roadless analysis. Please see Chapter 3. It also discusses the OHV decision and its effects on the Travel Plan. This decision was to restrict motorized use to designated routes or areas which the Travel Plan has done by designating routes. No areas were designated as open to unrestricted motorized use. The 2000 Roadless Rule did not restrict a National Forest from designating the types of uses on routes within the roadless areas and the Gallatin did not, therefore, use roadless as a criteria for determining designation of use on routes.
Timothy L. Ravndal	Montana Multiple Use Association, Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1032		Winter use of our public lands is a national economic factor that has not been considered with the preferred alternative. At a minimum, an economic impact statement must be made to insure that the impact by the implementation of the proposed alternative is documented, analyzed and mitigated.	Issues	The Expanded Social Economic Analysis has analyzed the economic effects of winter recreation on the Gallatin and disclosed the impact of that use on the various economic sectors of the local and regional economies. This analysis and its conclusions are contained within the FEIS and were used helping to formulate the final Decision.
Timothy L. Ravndal	Montana Multiple Use Association, Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1032		There is no meaningful discussion of the impact of reduced OHV access and recreation on the economy in Chapter 3.	Issues	The economic analysis in Chapter 3 of the DEIS was felt to be inadequate so immediately upon release of the DEIS and feedback from the public the Gallatin did an Expanded Social Economic Analysis and released it for public review and comment. This analysis is contained in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. It shows the effects of summer motorized recreation on the Gallatin, including OHV use. The analysis concluded there was no evidence to show

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						increases or decreases of actual use between Alternatives even though there were differences in mileages of open routes between Alternatives. Therefore, we could not project differences in economic effects.
Vicky Hoffman		1338	Clyde Park	The most recent economic impact study of the Forest does not represent or recognize the reality of the financial devastation of alternative 7 to our communities. "Scientific" is certainly an acceptable criteria when gathering some information, but the truth of reality can be a far step from the presumed quote scientific" data gathered.	Issues	You are correct that the economic analysis does not conclude that Alternative 7 will have a devastating effect on the communities. The economic sectors of the region are so large as to completely overshadow the economic effects of all recreation on the Gallatin National Forest, motorized and nonmotorized, winter and summer.
Eva Patten and Patti Steinmuller	BWAGs	467	Bozeman	If the resource protection goals of the FMP and the Travel Plan are to be met, the Travel Plan should give certainty to long term protection of natural resources and allow for timely and appropriate responses to unforeseen environmental impacts or misuse. This requires strong monitoring provisions..... - Some form of adaptive management based on conditions.	Issues	The Travel Plan does contain monitoring provisions to assess the progress envisioned in the plan. We realize that some parts of the decision will last longer than others and that in 4-5 years some updates to the plan may be necessary. The monitoring plan will give us the information to decide. These changes would take place through the NEPA process and with public input and review.
	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	619		OHV recreation has a very positive impact on the economy, yet this impact has not been adequately addressed in the DEIS. We request that this deficiency be corrected and the preferred alternative be adjusted to reflect the significance of the OHV associated economy.	Issues	The economic analysis in Chapter 3 of the DEIS was felt to be inadequate so immediately upon release of the DEIS and feedback from the public the Gallatin did an Expanded Social Economic Analysis and released it for public review and comment. This analysis is contained in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. It shows the effects of summer motorized recreation on the Gallatin, including OHV use. The analysis concluded there was no evidence to show increases or decreases of actual use between Alternatives even though there were differences in mileages of open routes between Alternatives. Therefore, we could not project differences in economic effects.
Marty Malone	Park County Extension	621	Pray	One very important factor that was not considered in the economic portion of the travel plan was "non employer receipts". These firms operate businesses without paid employees and do not reflect job increases or decreases in your economic analysis. In Park County, according tot he Census Department, there are 221 of these firms that have paid receipts of 6.4 million dollars. I feel that the people that did the economic analysis should modify their analysis to reflect this very important aspect of	Issues	The economic analysis estimated the labor income effects of the proposed plan. Labor income is income tied to employees and employers. Unpaid employees are not found in the economic data used for this analysis. This analysis was based on data from the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				the economy.		
Alex Phillips		1483a		The Lionhead ridge twists and turns and is seemingly connected to many other ridges even from the vantage point of the Continental divide. The creek is an obvious boundary and one look at the area will show why the writers of the recommended wilderness boundary choose the creek and not the ridge.	Lionhead	The travel plan does not propose any change in the Lionhead recommended wilderness boundary.
Don Bachman		625		Appendix B displays a monitoring plan. The plan appears comprehensive, but in comparing the annual cost estimate against the tasks and associated risks from insufficient monitoring, I am concerned that not enough funding will be available to match the goals. Please explain the rationale for such under funded monitoring, or give specific risk aversion tactics you will employ to insure the objectives of the Plan will be met.	Monitoring	The Monitoring Plan tries to present a balance between monitoring needs and the risk associated with activities that will have an effect on the monitoring items with the kinds of budgets the Forest can realistically expect. Monitoring activities have to be calibrated to the budget and the risk of not discovering potential effects on the resources that may be outside Forest Plan and other standards.
Doug McSpadden		711	Bozeman	Please establish some baseline data on trail and drainage health in areas that will allow motorized use no matter which plan you choose. That way if things deteriorate below a benchmark or threshold you can act swiftly and decisively.	Monitoring	The Gallatin does have good data on trail conditions and uses that are used to determine where maintenance and reconstruction priorities are. The Preferred Alternative describes designation of use on trails, and would set the benchmark for the next 10 to 15 years using our trails inventory data to help maintain the trail conditions necessary for the recreation experience expected and protect the resource conditions. We realize that keeping our trails from deteriorating is a high priority.
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		There should be an effective program for monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management to assure that effects of travel management are identified and management modified where necessary to reduce adverse effects. EPA supports monitoring and evaluation within an adaptive management approach for all resource conditions, not just water quality. Development of criteria or thresholds protective of resources (e.g. for aquatic and wildlife habitat) greatly assists effectiveness of adaptive management programs. Monitoring and evaluation of resource impacts relative to threshold values followed by subsequent management responses when thresholds are exceeded are what makes adaptive management programs work.	Monitoring	The Travel Plan monitoring program takes into account the resource effects that have been identified and disclosed in the DEIS and FEIS. Those effects considered most critical and/or least understood are those included in the monitoring plan. Adaptive change is understood to be an effective management style and that requires monitoring. Where resource data are precise enough to set threshold levels we use those. Forest Plan and other standards give us levels to monitor against.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
John F. Wardell	United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Montana Office	587		We recommend that the FEIS include monitoring components to evaluate effects of roads and trails and motorized uses on water quality, fisheries, wildlife, and other resources that are not well covered in the existing elements of the monitoring program. We also recommend that mechanisms for public disclosure of the monitoring analysis and the decisions for the Travel Plan be provided. The roles of the FS, other Agencies, independent science, and the public should be identified. The FEIS should discuss the future decision points in this adaptive process that may require additional NEPA analysis. The FEIS should also provide assurance that funding is available for monitoring and adaptive management.	Monitoring	The FEIS does provide a discussion of potential future changes to the Travel Plan as monitoring and adaptive management show social or resource condition changes warrant that would Travel Plan decision changes. The Monitoring Plan tries to present a balance between monitoring needs and the risk associated with activities that will have an effect on the monitoring items with the kinds of budgets the Forest can realistically expect. Monitoring activities have to be calibrated to the budget and the risk of not discovering potential effects on the resources that may be outside Forest Plan and other standards.
Tom Pick		329		The Hyalite area proposal is good, except I'd like to suggest that in the future motorbike use be monitored closely to evaluate the impacts of this use on other users and the natural resources associated with the adjacent Gallatin Crest high altitude trail system.	Monitoring	The Preferred Alternative considers alternating motorized and nonmotorized use on some Hyalite trails which would require close monitoring to evaluate its effectiveness on reducing conflicts between the different types of uses. Motorized use on the Gallatin Crest trail will continue to be monitored and assessed.
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness Society	1882		Among the most important monitoring efforts of the GNF are those looking at future needs and trends, including: Monitoring to determine population trends of indicator species and relationships to habitat changes; monitoring to identify research needs; and monitoring effects of ORV use and trends.	Monitoring	The monitoring activities selected for the Travel Plan monitoring program were chosen because they monitor key effects, because they are measurable, and because they were items that have more assurance of being funded.
Betsy Buffington	The Wilderness Society	1882		The FS should clearly address the specific results and analyses of past monitoring of OHV impacts and explain in detail how this data has informed their current plan revision.	Monitoring	OHV monitoring results have been incorporated into the Travel Plan decision. They provide a large part of the rationale for shifting the two track OHV trails that currently do not give the experience people are looking for to incorporating the project roads into the OHV trail system to give the longer, loop-type experience.
Alfred McGuire		25	Clyde Park	Why not if, the FS closes a trail it makes a new trail of equal length in an area acceptable to the motor traffic? This would balance the length of trails we have now and be acceptable	Motorized (General)	The evaluation of the entire road and trail systems on the Gallatin that took place during the travel planning process determined that the system was large enough to accommodate the recreating public and that very little new construction was necessary. We realize there is very little money for new trail construction and want to prioritize our spending on maintenance.
Jason McIntyre		522	Auburn, WA	I believe the DEIS summary to be bias against motorized use. This summary eliminates specific information which would clear earlier finger pointing	Motorized (General)	Yes, trail construction funds are limited, but the proposal to construct a small amount of additional ATV trail, mainly as connectors between already constructed

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
				at motorized use. i.e., resource damage that was later found negligible. [And] in the time of less funding for public land management, it seems the forest service is putting more effort into studies and regulations already on the books. i.e., 2001 OHV rule that eliminated the use of ATV's on single-track trails, it is already in effect. Speaking of (no) funds, the forest service suggest (with amendment #7) more trail building for riding in exchange for closure of off trail riding. If the FS has no funds, why trade off trail riding (no need for funds) for trail riding (need is great for funds)?		roads or trails to make longer loop trails, was based on the desire of ATV riders for this kind of experience. The 2001 OHV decision was already in place when the Gallatin began travel planning. It established the negative effects of off route travel as had the OHV monitoring that the Forest already had. Keeping ATVs on trails and still providing a satisfying experience for the user is our goal.
Dean Littlepage and Alex Phillips	Montana Wilderness Association Madison-Gallatin Chapter	1440		The Gallatin Petrified Forest is a world-class geological resource and deserves to be protected. The evidence points strongly to the use of visitor access by vehicle as the variable that most encourages left and vandalism. Therefore, by choosing to allow motorcycles in the area of the Gallatin Petrified Forest, the Forest Service in setting this amazing resource up for significant damage over the next 15 to 20 years. In fact, there is evidence that this is has already begun; between 1985 in 1988, monitoring indicates that 24% of the specimens being monitored showed signs of human caused damage. Subsequently, the Forest Service decided that a photo survey to determine the extent of damage would be completed every three years. Is this survey being carried out? We pointed out the relationship between OHV access and damage to the GNF in our previous comments, but the agency to our knowledge still has not addressed the impacts of the travel plan on this resource. How does the Forest Service plan to minimize damage to the removal of petrified wood in the WSA? We strongly urge the agency to include an assessment of damage to the Gallatin Petrified Forest in the final EIS, and to close the GNF area to motorized use in summer.	Petrified Forest	Monitoring has shown the effects of human caused damage to the Petrified Forest. The permit system that authorizes an individual to take a small sample of petrified rock from the area appears to have reduced an increase in damage. There is no evidence of a correlation in an increase in damage with the type of access, motorized, horse, or foot, into the area. The Forest will continue to monitor damage to this major geological resource.
Phil Knight	Native Forest Network	644		Allowing motorcycle use in this area is utterly inconsistent with preservation of this incredible resource, which is possibly the most extensive fossilized forest in the world.	Petrified Forest	Monitoring has shown the effects of human caused damage to the Petrified Forest. The permit system that authorizes an individual to take a small sample of petrified rock from the area appears to have reduced an increase in damage. There is no evidence of a

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
						correlation in an increase in damage with the type of access, motorized, horse, or foot, into the area. The Forest will continue to monitor damage to this major geological resource.
Catherine Weeden		1604		The Buffalo Horn is a very special case. The Grizzly Bear Recovery Area is there. The Gallatin Petrified Forest is there. This area is contiguous with Yellowstone National Park and could expand the haven for native plants and animals provided by the Park's protection. It is the southern terminus of the WSA. This area needs to be kept as isolated as possible.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The preferred alternative for the Buffalo Horn reflects its location at the southern end of the HPBH Study Area. ATV and motorcycle use on trails is reduced from current use and the emphasis for the area remains for the grizzly bear, big game, and other wildlife.
Kerry White		1616		Other trails adopted by the county in this area for motorized use are trail numbers 95, 39, 161, 560, 160, 165, 299, 178, 96, 167, 34, and 46. Possible loop trails of trail 1 to 199 to 34 to 180 to 167 to 178 to 299 to 160 back to trail #1. We could loop #1 to 199 to 34 to 160 back to #1. Small loop #1 to 39 to 161 to 560 back to #1.	Porcupine-Buffalo Horn	The Forest Service has jurisdiction and management responsibility for all National Forest System trails and roads on the Gallatin National Forest. The Forest Service has no information or evidence to indicate that Gallatin County has asserted rights to the trails you note in your comment or to any other National Forest System trail or road on the Gallatin National Forest. The Preferred Alternative for the Porcupine-Buffalo Horn area trails does not entirely reflect the current management of the trails as generally open to motorized use. Some of the trails mentioned would prohibit motorized use to meet the core habitat requirements of the Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy and provide non-motorized recreation opportunities. ATV use of trails would be restricted.
Tammy Sturgis		114		The economic analysis is not sufficient and was not done by someone that is qualified to accomplish this study. An economical analysis should be done by a certified, independent economist using true data and not possible scenarios. This is a critical issue as the proposed closures will have a definite adverse economic impact on the area.	Process	The Expanded Social Economic Analysis that was released during the DEIS comment period was done by a professional agency economist with over 20 years experience. It used the most recent Census Bureau and Department of Commerce demographic, employment, and income data available to accurately represent the true local and regional economy of the area. Using the most up to date survey information for recreation participation on the Gallatin National Forest it modeled the part that recreation plays in the local and regional economies. Conclusions were drawn about the effects of the Alternatives on the economy, but estimates of recreation participation changes among the Alternatives could not be accurately made so scenarios were used to demonstrate what changes might happen if actual participation were to change over the next several years.

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Andy Hopkins		509	Saratoga Springs, UT	I do not support any recommendation or alternative that produces a net loss in snowmobiling areas. …snowmobiles have nearly NO impact on the forest floor. …rural towns near these forest rely on the positive economic impact from snowmobilers to support their businesses throughout the slow winter season.	Snowmobiles	The Travel Plan Decision took into account the effect that winter recreation, including snowmobiling, has on the economies of small communities like Cooke City and West Yellowstone by keeping open much of area that is currently open to snowmobiling.
Ed Oliver		512	Milliken, CO	Why is it that every time I turn around someone is telling me that because I no longer have use of my left leg I no longer have the right to get out and into the backcountry. I ride snowmobiles in the winter to get into the backcountry. I generally take a 2 week vacation and come up to Montana .... I guess I will just tell my friends that we need not make the trip anymore because a bunch of PC minded enviro-nazis have determined that we are no longer welcome …Ever tried to cross country ski with only one leg??	Snowmobiles	The Travel Plan Decision for snowmobiling provides a wide and varied set of opportunities. We are sorry you are disappointed. Please look at the final decision to see exactly what your opportunities may be.
Kerry White		1616		Trails on the west side of the Bridgers that the county has identified for motorized use are 511, 513, 586, 535, 533, 544, and 545 all south of Flathead Pass. 511 and 513 should be changes to non-motorized by the county. These are close to the M and many hikers use them.	West Bridgers South	The Forest Service has jurisdiction and management responsibility for all National Forest System trails and roads on the Gallatin National Forest. The Forest Service has no information or evidence to indicate that Gallatin County has asserted rights to the trails you note in your comment or to any other National Forest System trail or road on the Gallatin National Forest. The Travel Plan Preferred Alternative would change a few of these trails to nonmotorized use only. This Alternative (7M) for the entire west side of the Bridgers took into account the growing amount of use the trails were getting and assumed this growth would continue and saw the need to provide a nonmotorized experience in some of the drainages. Therefore, the proposed changes are based on the desire to have a more varied set of recreational experiences for the Bridgers.
David Varricchio		2	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Carignan		3	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Vehrs		6	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
William Fellows		7	Clyde Park	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
William Hagon		15	Michigan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pat McKenna	Montanans for Quiet Recreation	16	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kirby and Denise Barford		17	Yellowstone National Park	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Dewch		22	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Diane Linder		24	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jean Miller		27	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cynthia Tureck		31	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jim Vernon		32	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rebecca J. Adams		1156	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lonnie Abelin		1157	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bob Alger		1158	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cory Alger		1159	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pam Alger		1160	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Phyliss Alger		1161	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Reginald Alger		1162	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Todd Alger		1163	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Wayne Alh		1164	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Claudie Alt		1165	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dale Alt		1166	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joew Amestoy		1167	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Stryker Anderson		1168		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chris Ankeny		1169	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gerald Antonovich		1170	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Katheryn A Bade		1172	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dan Baldwin		1174	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
AJ Baldwin		1175	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Vernon Ball		1175A	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert Bergsing		883		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ruth Bergsing		884	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bob Bolton		888	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Anita Brawner		892	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Molly Busby		895		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ron Chase/Virginia Watts		897		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cathy Covert		899	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jan Dunbar		905	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Deborah Goltz		920	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kathy Hansen		923	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Donna Hemmingsen		926	Livingston	dup of #925		
Jamie Hillman		928	Livingston	dup of # 908		
Daryl Kroon		940	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Pat McCarthy		947	Butte	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kalan Murano		951		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Mortel		953		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Nancy Ocheltree		954	Cedar Rapids IA	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Renee Post		961	Cooke City	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steven Pulaski		962	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alan Redfield		964	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Thomas Ross		971	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dean Sauskojus		972	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dick Shockley		976		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard Spellman		980	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brent Harrell		980A	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Thomas and Dena Warr		992		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dan Williams		996	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
George Wirt		997	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pat Wirt		998	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Beaver and Pam Carey		1006	Three Forks	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Gibson		1012A		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Elin Hart		1017	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brooke Homan		1018	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Anisha Hyers		1020	Blackbear GA	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Christine Jones		1022	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Curt Livingston		1023	Dennisport MA	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tricia Mayes		1026	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve and Mary Lou Osman		1034	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joe Balyeat	Montana Senate District #34	1176		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Banta		1178		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Larry Barnard		1179	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Barrett		1180	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Guy Dean Bateman		1181	St. Ignatius	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Paul Beck		1183		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charles Becken		1184	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Peggy Becken		1185	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kit Beley		1186	Big Timer	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Geoff Benbow		1187	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Janice Benham		1188		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jackie Berg		1189	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Russell Blalack		1192	Cupertino, CA	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Henry A Bommelyh		1198	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert Brandon		1202	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Arnold Breck		1203	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
David Breck		1204	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shirley Breck		1205	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Amy Breider		1207	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Aimee Baulanger		37	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rob Brandon		38	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Will Brenner		40	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Corey Biggers		41	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tracy Cameron		42	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Russell Chretien		44	Three Forks	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David L. Cole		45	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Wendy Cowdrey		46	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Donald Derby		47	Three Forks	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Leo DeVries		48	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Leah Frohnmayer		50	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marrietta B. Glase		51	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dwain Hackman		53	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ruth Hall	Backcountry Horsemen	55	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard Hargrove		57	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Blair Howse	Mountaineers 4x4 Club	59		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Deb Kimball		60	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Roger Koopman	State Representativ	61	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	e					
Ellen Kress		63	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve Kuchinsky		65	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steven Kurk		66	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Erica Lindner		24A	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve Masty		68	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dan McCuen		70	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chris Mehl		71	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Murphy		72	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charles Murtegh		73	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pierre Musy		74	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joseph R. Neuman		75	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Linda W. Pierce		77	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gary A. Porter		78	Manhattan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lee Provance		80	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Anne Rockhold	Wilderness Society	81	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ross Rodgers		82	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Scheck		83	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mary Schonsberg		84	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ken Smith		85	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brian Sobrepena		86	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Scott Walden		87	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Norm Weeden		88	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tim White	Citizens for Balanced Use	90	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brandon Wold	Citizens for Balanced Use	91	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Wold	Citizens for Balanced Use	92	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mardella Brock		94		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Justin Sobrepena		97	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Howie Woke and Marilyn Olssen	Big Wild Adventures	98	Emigrant	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Anonymous		99		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Nancy Weiman		101	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dan Smith		104	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
James M. Staples		105	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lonnie Sturgis		106		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kelly Wade		1597	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Scott Walden		1599	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Eric Waldman		1600	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Walker T. Weed		1603	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Nancy Weiman		1605	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert Weiman		1606	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gerlie Weinstein		1608	Cooke City	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jack Welch		1611	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Mathew Wells		1612		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard and Irene Wendel	Bozeman Gem and Mineral Club	1613	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jacob Wetzbarger		1614	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brent Wheeler		1615	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Julie Willard	Simms	1618	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kerih Williams		1619	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jacqueline Wilson		1620	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mark Wilson		1621	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Melanie Wilson		1622	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Windecker		1623	Wilsall	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Larry Wix		1624	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dolr Wood		1626	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ellen Woodbury		1627	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Len Wright		1628	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bryan Wyberg		1629	Minnesota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
James Yelich		1630	Tennessee	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Russ Young		1631	Reed Point	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ed Zacher		1633	Manhattan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jack R. Ziegler		♦♦♠	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dennis Zindler		1636	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Elaine Zindler		1637	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rex Ziph		1638	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jeff Anderson		1051		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jeffrey Banta		1053		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Michael Best		1055	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Howard Christiansen		1061	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Myron Clark		1062		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Melissa Cooney		1063	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marla Cope		1064	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dick Coppock	Association of Snowmobile Clubs	1065	Omak, WA	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John W. Criger		1066	Lakewood, CO	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cal Cumin		1067	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tony DiPangrazio		1068	Port Angeles, WA	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mr. and Mrs. Richard Elkins		1069	Mercer Island, WA	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cheryl Farmer		1072	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jim Fiddler		1073	Bigfork	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pat Fowlie		1074	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard M. Gillette		1075	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Hap Gilliland		1076	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve Gipe		1077	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jerome R. Glickman		1078	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Heini Miettinen-Granger		1079		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Audrey Hall		1081	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike, Kathy, Eric, Jessica Held		1082	White Sulphur Springs	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Aaron Hessinger		1083	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dan Hoskins		1084	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dave Hurwitz		1086		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tharin Huisman		1087		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gerry and Chuck Jennings		1088	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David B. Johnson		1089	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jerry Johnson	Backcountry Adventure	1090	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Laura B. Johnson		1091	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jeff Kinnick		1092	White Sulphur Springs	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert Knapp		1093	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jennifer Madgic		1096	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Elizabeth Marum		1098	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Donald and Margarita McLarty		1099	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Barbara Moll		1100	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Deborah M. Meyers		1102	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Sarah Nagy		1103	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chuck Neal		1104	Wyoming	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chris O'Conner		1107	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bella O'Neill		1108	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kimberly O'Neill		1111	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ann Palmer		1112	New Mexico	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Angela Patnode		1113	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sue Perin		1115	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John A. Peters		1116	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Linda Weston Pierce and Kenneth L. Pierce		1117		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Paul Rana		1118	Bigfork	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Michael Rifkind		1120		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rachel & Dave Rockafellow		1121	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jennifer Rowntree		1122	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Todd Russell		1124	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pat Simmons		1128	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mary "Oshi" Simsarian and Mark Clawson		1129	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ken Sinay	Yellowstone Safari Company	1130		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Michael R. Smith		1131	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Will Swearingen		1135	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Martin and Carol Teintze		1137	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mark Tokarski		1138	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charlotte Trolinger		1139	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Beverly, Hans and Thea Villinger		1141	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dick Walton		1142	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Nancy Warfel		1143	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Beth Weissman		1144	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Fred Wemer		1145	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Peter and Susan Werner		1146	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Davina White		1147	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Larry Whitney		1148	Columbus	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Judy Wilies		1149	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard Wojtowicz		1151	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kathleen Wright		1152	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bryan Wyberg		1153	Minnesota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Doug Rand		1491	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Eugenia Razzano		1492	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jane Reardon		1493	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Martin Reardon		1494	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Michael Redburn		1495	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Linda Regnier and Jim Regnier and Katie Regnier		1498	Lakeside	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Carol Reinmann		1498A	Shepherd	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lloyd Reinman		1498B	Shepherd	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Renskers		1501	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Scott Restvedt		1502	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Laura Rhodes		1503	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Leroy C. Rhodes		1504	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jack Roadarmel Jr.		1506	Three Forks	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jeremy Robertson		1507	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alice Robison		1508	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Paul Robinson		1509	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Anne Rockhold		1510	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brian Rogers		1511	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ellen B. King-Rodgers		1512	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ross Rodgers		1513	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jayme Rossman		1514	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Phil Rotherham		1515	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Scott C. Rouwhorst		1516	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Courtney Rue		1517	McLeod	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Judy A. Rue		1518	McLeod	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Victor R. Rue		1519	McLeod	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ken Salo		1521		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joe Sayer		1523		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
	Scenic City Trucking	1524	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Linda S. Schaefer		1525	Wilsall	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alta L. Schelton		1526	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
James Schelton		1527	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brent Scheack		1529	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lesley Schilling		1531	McLeod	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Denise Schmidt	Big Sky Hikers	1532	Big Sky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Matt Schmidt		1533	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Curt Scott		1534	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Scott		1535	Three Forks	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Susan Seibert		1536	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pete Sellin		1537	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Allen Severson		1538	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Eric Severson		1539	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Missy Severson		1540	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jaydee Shepherd		1541	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marc Shepherd		1542	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Mike Shepherd		1543	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Randall Shimkes		1543A	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dustin Sime		1546	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shawn Sime		1547	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pat Simmons		1548	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dan Skattum		1549	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Leonard Slemp		1549A	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gary Smart		1550	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brent Smith		1551	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cameron Smith		1552	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cory Smith		1553	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jeffrey J. Smith		1554	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Michael Speck		1556	Clyde Park	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert Spannring		1558	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rachel A. Spence		1559	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sandra Spendlove and Kelly Spendlove		1561	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Christopher Spogis		1562	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bill Springer		1562A	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bob Steinmann		1564	Manhattan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Steinmuller		1565	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jim Stephens		1566	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mark Stephens		1567	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kathleen Steven		1568	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bob Stevenson		1569	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Duane Stobbe		1570	Minnesota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jay Stomprud		1571	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jim Stoor		1572	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kirk Stovau		1573	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rob Strange		1573A	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lonnie Sturgis		1575	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Wiff and Mam Sundstrom		1576	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sharon Sutherland		1577	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
James Sweaney		1578		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Martin and Carol Teintze		1580	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Larry M. Tobin		1582	Wilsall	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sonny Todd		1583	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bruce Tollefson		1584	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tyler Tollefson		1585	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chad Tompers		1586	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Keith Tostin		1587	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Daryl L. Tuhenor		1588	Virginia City	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Steve Try		1589	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
E. Fred Tudor		1590	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Orpah Tudor		1591	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Paul Tunkis		1592	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Upper Shields Watershed Association, Southern Crazy Mountain Watershed Group		1593	Clyde Park	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rose Vallor		1594	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve and Mary Lou Osman		1034	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gene Quenemoen		1036	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tricia Stabler		1043		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alice S.. Tor		1047		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kipp Glimour		1290	Wilsall	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tony Gilpin		1291	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jamie Givens		1292	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ronald Glovan		1293		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Wayne Goffena		1294	Wilsall	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert Goodwine		1295	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alexis Goodyear		1296	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jesse Gore		1298	Tennessee	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tom and Barbara Greason		1299	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Stephen Green		1300	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
William Grey		1303	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Terry van der Hagan		1305	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chet Hagon		1306A	Michigan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
William Hagon		1307	Michigan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Greg Hall		1308	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Scott Hammond		1310	Gallatin gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cindy and Troy Harder		1312	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert Harper		1313	Columbus	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard Hargrove		1314	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tom Hargrove		1315	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Craig T. Harris		1316	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ronald E. Hartman		1318	Wilsall	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Haugan		1319	Willow Creek	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
James O. Hage		1320	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Clarence Hauschild		1321	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brian and Angela Hawthorne		1322	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Doyle Hayden		1323	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Larry Hayden		1324	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Linda Hayden		1325	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Held, Kathy Held, Eric Held,		1328	White Sulphur	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jessica Held			Springs			
Carolyn Heppel		1329	Tennessee	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joe Hebert		1331	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tom Hebetlh		1332	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marian Henry		1332A	Laurel	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dale V. Hert		1332B	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Diane Hewitt		1333	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kamron Hoffman		1336	Clyde Park	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Hodgenson		1339	Clyde Park	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kevin Holland		1341	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jeff Holman		1342	Manhattan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bobby Hookey		1343	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tracy Hookey		1344	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chris Horgan	Stewards of the Sequoia	1345	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Meg Huemptner		1349	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike and Joyce Huesemann		1350		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jim and Joan Morine		273	Eureka	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Susan Thomas		274	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kent Collier		275	Tennessee	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
				Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Claire and Tom (Jr.) Baiz		469		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Marian Kummer		470	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Arlie Lane		471	Havre	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ken Temple		474	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lydia Garvey		477	Clinton, OK	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Judd Grunzke		478		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Candy Hartman		479	Clinton, MT	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dotty Ballantyne		482	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Michael A. Ciccone		485	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sheila Garvin		486	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mr. & Mrs. Thomas H. Davis		492	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Daniel H. Henning	Friends of the Gallatin	493	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert Kensinger		495	Ennis	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joanne Fisher		502	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kevin Pepin and Veronica Taylor-Pepin		506	Crivitz, WI	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mark Hoffman	Crazy Mtn. Motorsports Inc	508	Clyde Park	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Randi Friez		516	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
P. Garcia		517		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tyson Stannebein		524		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Doug Anderson		526	Morgan, UT	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
	CBU	528	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
William L. Hutchison		532	Bigfork	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jeanne Moe		533	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bob Waldron		536	Wolf Point	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Martha D. Kelsey		538	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
James Maxwell Lowe		540	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lori Micken		542	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Paul Sturman		545	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kristina Urband	BWAGs	546	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jay Webber		547		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Michele Carey		548	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alan D. Hilden		550	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Susan Hinkins		551	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Martin and Mary Hamilton		277	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rodney Campbell		278	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Albert E. Honican		279	Florida	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dave Hurwitz		280	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mark Rohling		281	Kentucky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jacob Smulkowski		282	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
	Montana Women for Wilderness Protection	285A	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ed Oliver		285	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Todd Goulet		286	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sue Lang		287	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Morgan R. Leach		287A	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Leslie Blair Piercy		289	Big Sky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
George Williams		290		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ken Spalding		291	Maine	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tim McWilliams		294	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Steinmueller		295	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard and Sherrie Fast		296	Big Sky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alan Elliot		297		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chet Hagon		298	Michigan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert B. Ostrowski		299	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Justin Todd		300	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
William Brunckhorst		301	Laurel	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mary Alice Chester		302	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lorraine Snipper		305	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brooke Barnett		306	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kellie Cremer		307	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cheryl Engel		308	Minnesota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dyarle Sharkey		311	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Al Luebeck		312	Butte	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Shannon Kindle		313	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charles Ferguson		314	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Madsen		315	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lewis Stringer		316	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Fred Wemer		319	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Doug and Peggy Bogart		320	New Mexico	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marisa Hurwitz		321	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dale Alt		324	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Doug Gledhill		325		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
T.K. Wang		327	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chris Horgan		331		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dorothy Ballantyne		334	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Derek Weidensee		333		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Reg McCutcheon		338		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joe Kipphut		339	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tom Henesh		342B	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Martin and Mary Hamilton		277	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rodney Campbell		278	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Albert E. Honican		279	Florida	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dave Hurwitz		280	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mark Rohling		281	Kentucky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jacob Smulkowski		282	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
	Montana Women for Wilderness Protection	285A	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ed Oliver		285	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Todd Goulet		286	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sue Lang		287	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Morgan R. Leach		287A	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Leslie Blair Piercy		289	Big Sky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
George Williams		290		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ken Spalding		291	Maine	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tim McWilliams		294	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Steinmueller		295	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard and Sherrie Fast		296	Big Sky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alan Elliot		297		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chet Hagon		298	Michigan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert B. Ostrowski		299	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Justin Todd		300	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
William Brunckhorst		301	Laurel	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mary Alice Chester		302	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lorraine Snipper		305	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brooke Barnett		306	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Kellie Cremer		307	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cheryl Engel		308	Minnesota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dyarle Sharkey		311	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Al Luebeck		312	Butte	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shannon Kindle		313	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charles Ferguson		314	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Madsen		315	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lewis Stringer		316	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Fred Wemer		319	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Doug and Peggy Bogart		320	New Mexico	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marisa Hurwitz		321	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dale Alt		324	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Doug Gledhill		325		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
T.K. Wang		327	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chris Horgan		331		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dorothy Ballantyne		334	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Derek Weidensee		333		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Reg McCutcheon		338		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joe Kipphut		339	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tom Henesh		342B	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Patricia Dowd	Greater Yellowstone	1302		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Coalition					
Robert Campbell		741		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Priscilla and John Dolan		742	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Vonda Gallagher	BWAGS	743	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bobbi J. Geise		744	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Greggory		745	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brook Haag		746	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
KiKu and John W. Hanes, Jr.		747	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charles M. Hedrick		748	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ginny Heimann		749	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Hillsburg		750		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pat Jennings		753	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kere Kensinger		754	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Douglas MacCartney		759	Gardiner	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Michael Makara		761		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sarah Merrill		763	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Catherine Nelson		765		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Owen Moroney		766		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Quammen		768	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kathie Rivers		770	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Levi Rugheimer		771	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Philip Saccoccia, Jr.		772	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Phyllis Sangster		774	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bill and Sally Jackson		1351	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Justin C. Jetter		1352	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Aaron Johnson		1352a	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Clarence Johnson		1354	Gardiner	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Greg Johnson		1355	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marnie Johnson		1356	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John W. Jutila and family		1359	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Patricia Kamrath		1360	Wilsall	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Thomas and Mary Keck		1363	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Amy Kelley		1364	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Matt Kelly		1365	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David B. King		1367	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Wendy Kleker		1368	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Corey Koenig		1370	Manhattan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kirsten Krack		1372	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Janet and Don Kraft		1373	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Krirsten Kovash		1375	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dustin Krob		1378	Virginia	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Janet Krob		1379	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
T. J. Krob		1380	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Kunkle		1382	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dan Kuchinsky		1383	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve Kuchinsky		1384	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Doug Kurk		1385	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Melody Kurk		1386	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
C. M. Lamb		1388	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jason Lambrecht		1389	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Wayne Lambrecht		1390	Roundup	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve Larson		1392	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Frank Lawerell		1393	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brian D. Lents		1394	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jason Leppi		1395	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
George Levings		1396	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ron Lewis		1397	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gary Shane Lim		1398	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Carol Lingard		1399	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tom Lingard		1400	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dave Lisac		1401		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charlie, Alice, Donna Little		1402		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brian Littleton		1403	Wyoming	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Orvin Lotenbauer		1404	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Betty Long		1405	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jerry Long		1406	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Laura M. Lubner		1407	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Russell Lubner		1408	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ed Luke		1409		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ross Lynn		1410		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Milee Malone		1412	Pray	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ryan Malone		1413	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jenny Martin		1414	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Donald Mattusch		1416	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dan McCann		1418	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mandy McClurg		1419	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shanna McCuaig		1420	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jim McFalls		1421	Michigan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charles McLaughlin		1422	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rob McFall		1423		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jonathan McKinney		1424	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jen McManus		1425	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sandra McManus		1426	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Peter H. McNair		1427	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Laine McNeil		1428	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Todd J. Meagher		1429	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ryan Megenity		1430	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Thomas Meierhoff		1431		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mary Melcher		1431b	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Erik Mien		1431c	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kevin Miller		1432	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jennifer Mohler		1434	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Justin Mohler		1435	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joan Montagne		1437	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike		1439		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marc Montel		1442	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Randy A. Morin		1445	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tom Muggenbury		1447	Harlo	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Norm Mullen		1448	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Eric Murphy		1450	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bill Nemith		1456	Michigan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mick Nettles		1457	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Todd Newton		1459	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lauren Nissen		1460	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Norcika		1462	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Kathy O'Hare		1463	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joal Olson		1463a	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bella O'Neill		1464	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Deni Rae O'Neill		1465	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
		1467		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kimberly O'Neill		1470	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sean O'Neill		1471		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shay O'Neill		1472	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Roger Osborne		1472c	Laurel	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Stacy Osborne		1472d	Laurel	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sandy K. Ott		1474	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Randy Palin	Gallatin Valley Snowmobile Association	1475	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Doleg Parisi		1476	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Karri Parisi		1477	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jon Parker		1478	Wyoming	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gary Porter		1479	Manhattan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dave Peck		1479a		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chris Perkins		1480	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ed Peterson		1482	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jay Pierson		1483	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Christine Phillips		1483b	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Phillips		1483c	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ken Pierce		1483d	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gage Pike		1484	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Nancy Pitblado		1484a	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Amy Plumb		1485	Michigan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Phillip Polillo		1485a	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sharon G. Polillo		1485b	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Wayne Pollari		1486	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pat Povah		1488		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Darryl J. Prokop		1489	Three Forks	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Anthony Quirini		1490	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ken Aho		734	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Grant Assay		735	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jeremy Bartsch and Bridget Bartsch		736	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Bechberger		738	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kate Hollowell		620	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Patricia J. Mashale		622	Emigrant	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bob Swinth		623	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Nina Tomaszewski		624	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Chad Howe		626	Oregon	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kristina Ivanson		627	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Van P. Kede		628	Hamilton	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
F.H. (Harry) McNeal		630		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chris Naumann		631		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mark Poe		632		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lydia Garvey		638	Oklahoma	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
James Goehrung		639	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Karen Grigry		641		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Duane M. Johannsen		642	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Peter and Vicky Lockwood		644a	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Agnes Luft		644b	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dan Rosengren		644c	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Farwell Smith		645	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Florence Zundel	High Country Motel, Inc.	647	Cooke City	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
James Bell and Kristine Bell		648	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dee Blank		649	Whitefish	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Williams S. Dockins		650	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jeffrey Gishen and Candace Lorenson		651	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Greg Halbach		652	Arizona	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jet Holoubek		654	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rachel Rockafellow		657	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Craig Bredvold		658	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bud Cahill, Sandra Christensen/Cahill, Jeff Cahill	Sixty Three Ranch	659	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lawrence Dowdin		659a	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gretchum Hedrick		665	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jodi A. Hilty and David H. House.		666	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sarah G. Hughes		668	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
J. David Arterburn		555	Cameron	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Doris Arterburn		556	Cameron	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jeanne and Norman Eggert		557	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joe Gutkoski	Montana River Action	558	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kay Rasch		560	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
J. Douglas Sangster		561	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Derek Weidensee		562	South Dakota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Anne L. Angermeyr		563	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jim Bartsch and Tammy Bartsch		564	Brady	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Arnold shapiro		566	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jim Stoltz	Wild Wind Records	567	Big Sky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sean Austin		568	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Ralph H. Berry		569	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Norman A. Bishop		570	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charlie and Jeanne Cummings		571		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kevin Fletcher		572		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joe Gaab		573	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Klaus H. Gump		574	Big Sky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gary Harris		576		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert D. Hiaring		577	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Carolyn Hopper		578	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marisa Hurwitz		579	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mrs. Cory Klatt		580	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Harold Levens		581	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Suzanne McDonald		582	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Nardella		583	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Denis G. Brandon		585	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dan Canfield		586	Utah	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Aaron Jones		670	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kevin Mack		671	Mayland	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sally Maison		672	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Don Mazzola and Lu Goodrum		673	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Linda McMullen		674		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rolane Meyer		675	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Aleks Navratil		678	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Erich Pessl		682	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Irene Ploof		683	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
William S. Reed		685	Big Sky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard Roche		687	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joan Ryshavey		688	Manhattan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Betty and Bill Sommers		689	Cooke City	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Matt Tomaszewski		690	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Burton Pretty On Top Sr.	Crow Tribe	691	Crow Agency	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Carl Thor Anderson		693	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Grant Barnard		694	Red Lodge	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Loren Bough		697	Big Sky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Walt Burns		698		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Laura Fedro Chisholm		699		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Linda Y. Clark		700		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lynn J. Clemon		701	Pennsylvania	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Amy F. Davis		702	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Vanda Gallagher		704	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Vanda Gallagher		705		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Thomas H. Gibson		706		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Geroge Mattson		709	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Doug Mavor		710	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joe Newman		712	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Taylor Orr		714	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
C. Frederick Overby		715	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Don Perry		716	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Wendy Pierce		717	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Paula Poehls		719	Laurel	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Raeheen Roadamel		720	Three Forks	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve Robbins		721	Red Lodge	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jack T. Robertson		722	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Carolyn Roche		723	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dave Rockafellow		724	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert Schultz		725	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Irmeli Smith		726	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robin Starbuck		727		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ralph and Betsy Stephens		728	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Leslie Stoltz		729	Big Sky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Debra Turnquist		730	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brady Wiseman	Montana House of	733	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
	Representatives - House District 65					
Joan Morine		273	Eureka	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Susan Thomas		274	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kent Collier		275	Tennessee	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Martin A. Hamilton and Mary T. Hamilton		277	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rodney Campbell		278	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Albert E. Honican		279	Florida	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dave Hurwitz		280	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mark Rohling		281	Kentucky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jacob Smulkowski		282	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
	Montana Women for Wilderness Protection	285a	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ed Oliver		285	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Todd Goulet		286	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sue Lang		287	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Morgan R. Leach		287a	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Leslie Blair Piercy		289	Big Sky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
George M.		290		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ken Spalding		291	Maine	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tim McWilliams		294	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
David Steinmuller		295	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard and Sherrie Fast		296	Big Sky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alan Elliot		297		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chet Hagon		298	Michigan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert B. Ostrowski		299	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Justin Todd		300	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
William Brunckhorst		301	Laurel	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mary Alice Chester		302	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lorraine Snipper		305	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brooke Barnett		306	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kellie Cremer		307	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cheryl Engel		308	Minnesota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Clinton Peterson	Mt. Hood Snowmobile Club	309	Oregon	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dyarle Sharkey		311	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Al Luebeck		312	Butte	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shannon Kindle		313	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charles Ferguson		314	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Madsen		315	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lewis Stringer		316	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Fred Wemer		319	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Doug and Peggy Bogart		320	New Mexico	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marisa Hurwitz		321	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dale Alt		324	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Doug Gledhill		325		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
T.K. Wang		327	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chris Horgan		331		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Derek Weidensee		333		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dorothy Ballantyne		334	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Reg McCutcheon		338		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joe Kipphut		339	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tom Henesh		342b	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Farnes		343	Sidney	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Daryl Cheek		347		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
B. Halliwell		348	Canada	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David R. Stevens		349	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Candace Heath		350	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
The Krob Family		351	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Wayne Kennedy		352	Georgia	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John L. Sparks		354	Manhattan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bunny Gaffney		355	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Patrick M. Holland		356	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Curt Vogel		357	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sue and Bruce Martin		358	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kerry Reif		359	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ralph Richardson		360	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shirley Richardson		361	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Celestine Arndt		362	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
James E. Butcher		363		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Will Grohmann		364	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David J. Jones		365	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve Lohse		366	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ron Nusbaum		367	Absarokee	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
C.T. Walker		368	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Max Barker		369	Augusta	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dave Colavito		370	New York	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Carolyn Sears		372	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Michael G. Rogers		373	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Scott Bischke		374	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
William K. Medlin		375	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shiley and Jack Torkelson		376		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ed Bergquist		377	Gardiner	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Philip Chiaviello		378	Illinois	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Bob Nasheim		379		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
William G. Veno		380	Massachus etts	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Hussinger		382	Emigrant	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Andrea V. Seavey		383	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Suzane Bennett		384	Texas	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Matt lavin		385	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jenny Goodman		386	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Eugene Krebsbach		387	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John S & Eleanor Mest		388	Manhattan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Al Pendergrass		389	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Phyllis J. Crolius		390	Massachus etts	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mark Cunnane		391	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ronald Dyslin		392	Illinois	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mr. and Mrs. David L. Fisher		393	New York	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dave Dahlin		394		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Wililam McDowell		395	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marcy Barge		396		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lydia Garvey		397	Oklahoma	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Winn Schwyhart		399	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charles Jones		400	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mary Lou Osman		401	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Nyla S. Chandler		402	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pete Hart		403	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marvin T. Beatty		404	Wisconsin	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alan Elliot		405		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert Handelsman		406	Illinois	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sam Lowe-Anker		407	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Scott Bischke and Kate Gibson		408	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sherrill Halbe		409		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pat Helvey		410		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lexi L. Gulbranson		412	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Donald Scudder		413	Ennis	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tom Kilmer		414	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tim Montee		415	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert Ost		416		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Phil Adler		417		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard A. Damon		418	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert J. Quinn		419	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marlene Renwyck	Montana Women For	420	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cathy Whitlock		421	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chainsaw Mike		422		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tammera Crone		423	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Michael J. Yochim		424	Gardiner	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bob Hawks	Montana State Senate	425	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Eugene Krebsbach		426	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alex Phillips and Dean Littlepage	Montana Wilderness Association - Madison-Gallatin Chapter	427	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bryant Barnard		428	Massachusetts	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kathy Russell		429	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Walter L. Slomski		430		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Varricchio		431	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Constance Andrews		432	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Michael E. Wheat	Montana State Senate	433	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David C. Klatt		434	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Andrew Malucelli		435	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Barb Sachau		436	New Jersey	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Justin Eyre		437	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Donnal Poppe		438	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kelly McCandless		440		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jennifer Bos		441	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jerod Bos		442	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cynthia Cochran		443	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Mr. and Mrs H. Donald Gouge		444	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ron Kraftjack		445	Pennsylvania	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve Didier	Back Country Horsemen of America	446	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jack Fisher		447	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Julie Fuchs		448	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Katherine Cremer-Vogel		449	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tom and joan Barsack		451	Minnesota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Duncan and Eva Patten	Black Butte Ranch	452	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jesse L. Varnado		453	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Noreen Breeding		454		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Doug Elson		455		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Carl D. Esbjornson		456	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dana Huschle		457	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cory Klatt		458	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Elena Uler		459	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marilyn Wessel		460	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ken B.		461		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Paula Chatary		462	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
June Safford		463	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gonnie I. Siebel		464	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Joe Sykes		465	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bill Barnett		1640	Emigrant	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Dendy		1641	Gardiner	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cary B. Lund		1642	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Carolyn Hopper		1643	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Stephen A. Larson		1644	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Nandita Shah		1645	Maryland	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Don Gordon		1647	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
skipped number		1648		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ted Campbell		1650		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Donald & Margarita McLarty		1651	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dave Peck		1652		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jenna and Rose Caplette		1653	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dale Mortensen		1654		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rusty Roberts		1655	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Philip Soccoccia, Jr.		1656	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ed Verry		1657	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Greg and Ellen Erickson		1658	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jim Madden		1659	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charles Schott		1660	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jan Schott		1661	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Melissa Bahleda		1662	Virginia	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Avis Chenoweth		1663		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Josh Burnim		1664	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joanne Cortright		1665	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Larry G. Ellison		1666	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
P. Edwards		1667		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mary Katherine Egan		1668	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Susan Ewing		1669	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Hans, Sharon, Jake and Lucas Figi		1670	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard Flor		1671	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Todd Goertzen		1673	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sherill Halbe		1674		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Craig hall		1675	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pat Hammell		1676	Wisconsin	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jim Haeck		1678	Michigan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joan Hedrick	Grizzly Meadows Land Association, Inc.	1679	Gardiner	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charley hester		1680	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marilyn Kjellen-Rogers		1682	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Carl Krob		1683	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dustin J. Krob		1684	Virginia	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Judy and Jim Krueger		1686	Choteau	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard Latterell		1688		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Josh Meyer		1690	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jeff Milchen		1691	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve Moore		1693	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gian Andrea Moressi		1694	Conneticut	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alan Oram		1696	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gil Jordan and Kimberly Pinter		1697	Coram	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Clint Portnell		1698	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Blaine Pucinaton		1699	Cameron	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Katkhy Roberts		1700	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Raeann Rorah		1701	Michigan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bill and Peggy Ryan		1702	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bob, Kiki, Claire, and Johanna Rydell		1703		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gary Sandusky		1704	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Paul J. and Jody J. Sanford		1705	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marina Smith		1706a	Cameron	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kevin Wallace		1706b	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Alysson Statz		1707	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Tyler		1709	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
William B. Wbb		1710	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Michael Lee Whaley Jr., Erika Mae Whaley, Kevin Michael Whaley		1711	Nevada	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marsha Wheaton		1712	Michigan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
J. Kathleen White		1713	New York	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kerry White	Citizens for Balanced Use	1714	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Earl J. Wortman		1716	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rachel Yoerg		1717	Minnesota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jodie York		1718	North Dakota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
	Various Business Owners	1720		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charles Szasz		1722	Gardiner	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joe Baltrusch		1723		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Christianson Family		1724		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charlotte McGuinn Freeman		1726	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
anonymous		1727		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve Rapp		1728	Big Sky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kelly Matheson		1729	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chris McBee		1730	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Tommy Widner		1731		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard S. Wolff		1732	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Norman A. Bishop		1733	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Hans Figi and Family		1734	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ron Nusbaum		1735	Absarokee	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
skipped number		1736		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robin Starbuck		1738		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Andrew W. Smith		1739		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Daniel Spurr		1740	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Peter V Barrett		1742	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bill Corbett		1743		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Byron Erickson		1744	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kris Fedro		1745	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Wade Montee		1747	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jay Pierson		1748		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rob Arnaud		1750		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Doug Croghan		1751	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kurt McCauley		1752	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Aderhold	Montana Department of Fish Wildlife and Parks	1753	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alyssa Pfaff		1755	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Savatore Vaspol		1756	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John J. McKenna Jr.		1758	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Volney Steele		1759	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Danniel Ball		1760	Ohio	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Caroline Jurovic		1761	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Janis Keske		1762	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ted Schultz		1764	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Volney Steele		1765	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dean Center		1766	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Phil Hess		1768	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Loren Smith		1769	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Broad		1771	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charles Fritz		1772	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Christina Kim		1773	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gayleen Malone		1774	Pray	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marty Malone		1776	Pray	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lynn Paul		1777	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steven M. Quist		1778	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charles Fligel		1779	Butte	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
William Gray		1780	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve Helm		1781	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Garrett Peters		1782	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jodi Sangster		1784		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ryan Bergstrom		1786	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mary Brauer		1787	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joshua W. Burnim		1788	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gerald M. Gaston		1790	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Susan King		1791	Massachus etts	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Paige Lutes		1792	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert Mullenix		1793	Montana City	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Paul Spray		1794	Tennessee	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jeff Stoltenberg		1795	Texas	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jerry L. Barker		1796	Texas	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Heidi Benowitz		1797	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lydia Garvey		1798	Oklahoma	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mark Jacoby		1800	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John W. Jutila and Family		1801	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tommy Pinkston		1802	Tennessee	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Duane McCauley		1803		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Michael e. Sidders		1804	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
George Troy		1805		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Geanette Cebulski		1806	Seeley lake	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jeff and Judy arrin		1807	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John R. Fontana		1808	Big Sky	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Andrew and Mary Louise Gasienica		1809	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Greg Illes		1810		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Daniel Lilja		1811		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dave Tunge		1812	South Dakota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Richard A. Benton		1813	Missouri	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jim Booth		1814	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve Rossiter		1815	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John O. Baber		1816	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Nadine and Steven W. Burak		1817	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Clow		1818	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gary Confer		1819	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Peter Gross		1820	Kalispell	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
William E. Olson		1821		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Crista Worthy		1822	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lilli Hoffman		1824	Virginia	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Blake Maxwell		1825	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Etchart		1826		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Susan Evilsizer		1827	Ohio	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shirley Julian		1828		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Kimberly E. Kotur		1829		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Paul Neubauer		1830	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Guy Parker		1831	Oregon	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rob Ryan		1833	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jack A. Smith		1834	Wyoming	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robyn Bridges		1835	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ken Salo	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	1836	Helena	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gordon Levin		1837		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bill Paul	Montana Pilots Association	1838		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Shay		1839	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ross Stocker		1840		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Debbie Alke	Montana Aeronautics Division, Department of Transportation	1841		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ronald I. Apfelbaum		1842	Utah	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dave Bennett		1843	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Thomas W. Clements		1844	Arizona	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rick Giger		1845		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Scott Funk		1847	Wisconsin	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rick Geiger		1848		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Terry Kennedy		1850	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Tom Pick		1851	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John R. Swanson		1852	Minnesota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Thomas A. Warr		1853	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bill Whatley		1854	Texas	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Carl D. Esbjornson		1856	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Randy Grohman		1857		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Randy Hand		1858	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shane Kesterke and family		1860	Seeley lake	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joseph McMillen		1861	Ohio	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lisa Moye		1862	North Carolina	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Philip Noreen		1863	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Diane Poesall		1864	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Stephen Sayre		1865	Massachus etts	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Greg Hall and Kathleen Stanley		1866	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gary turner		1867	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Watts		1868	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lona Woodke		1869	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shannon Bloor		1195	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Henry Bommelth		1198	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bean Bowers		1199	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Stacy Bragg		1200	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Dennis O. and Margret Brandon		1201	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert Brandon		1202	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Arnold Breck Jr.		1203	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Breck		1204	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shirley Breck		1205	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Noreen Breeding		1206	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Amy Breider		1207	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Christina M Brown		1208a	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jarvis Brown		1210	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John A Brown and Patricia G Brown		1211	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Virjeana Brown		1212	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lee Brunckhorst		1213	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Will Brunner		1214	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Carlos Buhler		1215	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Eric Bunkers		1217	Minnesota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Corlann Gee Bush		1218	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rebekah Bunting		1219	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Katie Cady		1220	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dan Call		1221	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Eric Campbell		1222	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Rooney Campbell		1223	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jenna and Rose Caplette		1224	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joe Cashman		1226	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tracy Cashman		1227	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Keith D. Castleberry and Lorene J. Marcineck		1228	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sigrid Gentile-Chambers		1230	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joe Chapman		1231	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Scott Chapman		1232	Idaho	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Chaundy-Smart		1233	Canada	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jack Childress		1234	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Christopher		1235	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cassi Clampitl		1237	Manhattan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Lynn J. Clemons		1238	Pennsylvania	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Craig Couatre		1239	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Coleman		1240	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jeff Comfort		1241	Minnesota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joyce Connors		1242	Dillon	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brian Cooke		1243	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kevin Cook		1244	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jay Cowan		1246	Manhattan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Del Crabtree		1247	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dave Cronk		1248	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Juliette Crump and Bill Bevis		1249	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brett Davis		1250	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dean DeCock		1252	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jack Dockery		1253		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Dollimer		1254	Minnesota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chuck Donouan		1255	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Dormian		1256	Canada	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Crissy Dougherty		1257	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Dougherty		1258	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Laurel Douglas		1259	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Rene hartman Douglas		1260	New York	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Valorie Drake		1262	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jack Dyer		1263	Manhattan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kevin Dynes		1263a	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sharon Erckhott		1265	Wilsall	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joel and Lucy Ellefson		1266	Manhattan	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Craig Emter		1267	Reedpoint	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ben Erickson	Citizens for Balanced use	1268		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Glenna Eschenko		1269	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
John Etchart		1270	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shaney Evans		1271	Gardiner	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike Fanning		1273	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Russ and Rosei Faust		1274	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jesse Feathers		1275	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jack Jay Federer		1276	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Andrew Ferre		1277	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ken Fike		1278	Big Timber	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tuli Fisher		1279	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Tim Fitzgerald		1280	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Adam L. Forshlund		1281	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kent Foust		1282	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dale Freeburg		1283	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Duane and Lois Fremont		1284	Wilsall	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Josich Funk		1285	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
skipped number		1871		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ron Brey		1872	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Claire Cantrell		1873	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sam, Laurie, Jocelyn, and Kara Francis		1874	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Josh Otis		1876	Emigrant	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Pat LeBaron		1877	Oregon	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jerry Riekenberg		1878		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jerry Riekenberg		1879		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Todd Sangster		1880	Massachusetts	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ross Taylor		1881		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Paul Belzer		1883	North Dakota	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Steve Bracken		1885	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ron Brey		1886	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Janel Carino		1888	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marcia Tanner Coleman		1889	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pamika Collins		1890	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Cathy Costakis		1892	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Debra DeBode		1893	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
anonymous		1896		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brett Fagan		1897	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jessica Fultz		1900	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Thomas H. Gibson		1901	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jerry Gray		1902	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
William P. Inskeep		1903	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John ?		1904		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Angela Kociolek		1905	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Brian McCarty		1906	Harrison	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
anonymous		1908		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Barbara Rusmore		1909	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shannon Taylor	Headwaters Fish and Game Association	1911		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bob Ekey	The Wilderness Society	1911a	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Carolyn Caine		1912	California	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bob Kembel		1913		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jerry DiMarco		1917	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ronald E. Teig		1918	Harlowton	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
skipped number		1919		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
	Back Country Horsemen	1920		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brian F. Barker		1921	Washington	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Felix Moran		1922	Polson	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Noreen Breeding		1923	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ryan Norton		1924	Missoula	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joe Polus		844	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Reynolds		845	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jacqueline Robinson		847	Georgia	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Judy Rost		848	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jim Rozon		849		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pete Rugheimer		850	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Marlene Saccoccia		851	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Art Sandborgh		852	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ron and Barb Stafford		855		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Robert Staffanson		856	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ralph and Betsy Stephens		857	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bruce		859	Colorado	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brett Tandy		860	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ann Twomey		864	New Jersey	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Watts		865a		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Margret Webster		866	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dan Westrup		868	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dale White and Susannah White		869	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
J. Kathleen White		870	New York	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mary Ellen and Tom Wolfe		871	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Fran Zelenitz		872	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Fred Pessl		842	Gallatin Gateway	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Wayne and Colleen Peterson		843	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dr. Robert Campbell		741	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pricilla and John Dolan	BWAG	742	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Vanda Gallagher		743	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Bobbi J Geise		744	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Greggory		745	West Yellowstone	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Brook Haag		746	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kiku and John Hanes Jr.		747	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Charles M. Hendrick		748	Great Falls	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ginny Heimann	BWAG	749	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Hillsburg		750		Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Barry Krayer		756	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Matt Lavin		757	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Douglas MacCartney		759	Gardiner	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Michael Makara		761	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Sarah Merrill		763	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Catherine Nelson		765	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Owen Moroney		766	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
David Quammen		768	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Phyllis Sangster		774	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alexander Sievers		776	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Hessic Taylor	BWAG	779	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kirk Thompson		781	Stevensville	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Dr. O. Alan Weltzien		784	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Jeanie Westnedge	BWAG	785	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Luanne Atchison		787	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
John Bastian		788	Oregon	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Chuck Beck	MSA Pres.	789	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike and Stephanie Becker		789	Harrison	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Scott Bischke		790	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Gary L. Bishop		791	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Louise Bowman		792	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Barbara Brewster		794	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Joe Bryan		795	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Pamela Chiang Bryan		796	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ted Bryan	Bar None Ranch	797	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Deb Cades and Shenen Rodman		798	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Nyla Chandler		801	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Michael A. Ciccone		802	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Patricia Cosgrove, MD		803	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
T.H. Crawford		804	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Louise Cross		805	Glendive, MT	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Terry Cunningham		807	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kasey Daschbach		808	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
George Durkin		810	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		

Name	Organization	Letter #	City	Comment	Code	FS Response
Odessa Eddie		811	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Greg and Ellen Erickson		812	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kathy Gallagher		814	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Laura and Todd Harris		816	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jack Heckles		817	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Wendy Heckles		818	Livingston	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Alan Hooker		819	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jacqueline Rieder Hud		820	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
James and Madilyn Jones		823	Billings	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Shirley Lambeth		827	Boulder	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Eric and Rachel Lutz		828	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Jim Madden		829	Belgrade	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kay Matthews		830	New Mexico	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Keith McCormic		831	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Kevin McCrecken		832	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mary McFadzen		833	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Ken McKenna		835	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		
Mike O'Connell		838	Bozeman	Letter had no substantive comment requiring response.		