

Proposal - modify travel plan on Bear Canyon Trail #440 to extend motorized travel from October 14 to December 1

Letter #	type of response	Name	Date	Comment	Forest Service Response
1	note	Mr. John C. Sparks	no date	Can no longer hike because of age; so uses motorized	The proposed action would extend opportunities for motorized travel in the Bear Canyon area.
2	letter	David R. Stevens	10/12/2010	Extension would allow ATVs and snowmobiles to dominate hunting season, and eliminate foot and horse hunters.	The proposed action would extend the season that motorized users could access the Bear Canyon Area through the general big game season. However, motorized users are required to stay on the designated routes within the area. Many areas of the drainage would still provide non-motorized hunting opportunities off of the designated motorized trail system. The travel plan decision also provided numerous areas nearby Bear Canyon where fall motorized use is prohibited during the general hunting season (e.g. most of the trails within the Bridgers, Bozeman Creek, upper Hyalite and the Gallatin Crest, Trail Creek, Chestnut Mountain, and all of the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study area). There are no proposed changes to the travel plan configuration for snowmobiles in the drainage.
3	email	Phil Knight	11/9/2010	Issue is unstable soil and long history of terrible trail conditions. Suggest we complete trail work and then access the trails. Monitor compliance with closure and whether wildlife patterns change.	Your letter of 11/09/10 raises valid points regarding Bear Canyon trail conditions. The use of trails in Bear Canyon for motorized recreation will require trail rehabilitation to meet Gallatin NF trail standards before motorized use can use the area without additional trail damage. Many of the trail upgrades have been completed along the lower trail #440 system including the new trail alignment in Section 6 T3S R7E on the east side of Bear Creek, obliteration of the original trail on the west side, and improved drainage, new trail bridges, and improved trail surface durability in sections 7, 8, 9, 17, 20 of T3S R7E. The remainder of the Bear Canyon trail system is currently under contract to complete trail improvement work in sections 20, 21, 22, and 28 of T3S R7E. This additional trail upgrade will consist of improved drainage, trail surface puddle reduction, more durable subgrade, and rehabilitating and blocking of unauthorized spur user made motorized ATV and motorbike routes. The new sections of rehabilitated trails will not be opened to public motorized use until all the trail improvements are completed. The incremental additional trail maintenance use from extending the season from October 15 – December 2 may require further maintenance such as spot gravelling, more drainage structure cleaning, and additional subgrade strengthening. The additional maintenance will be consistent with trail maintenance procedures discussed in the Travel Plan FEIS and ROD.
4	letter	Shelly Watters	11/9/2010	Comment that because the Travel Plan decision for Bear Canyon is in violation of various laws, it should be withdrawn. An interim agreement between the Forest Service and Gallatin County was signed in June 2010 because the Bear Canyon travel decision violates law. The Forest Service had 4 years to sign an agreement with the county on the road portion of trail #440, but failed to do so. Thus they obliterated the road without a signed agreement. During the travel planning process, the only signed document that the Forest Service received from the County Commission was a November 2002 letter which stated, "In [Bear Canyon], we do not feel that motorized use on this portion of the trail, which is also a county road, is in the public interest." The Travel Plan should have reflected this input. The Bear Canyon Travel Plan also violates NEPA because it did not address the social, environmental and economic impacts that were raised in appeal. In addition, the Travel Plan continues to be in violation of Montana laws that govern the use of vehicles on public roads. Off-road vehicles with OHV registration decals that are legal on Forest Service trails will not be legal on any county road portion of Trail #440. Even if the County abandons most of their easement, there will still be a County road portion between the parking lot and trailhead gate. Only licensed vehicles and riders will be able to use the access.	Regarding the point that the Travel Plan decision for Bear Canyon violates NEPA, the commenter made this claim in an appeal of the Travel Plan decision filed in January of 2007. After the appeal review, the decision was affirmed by the Regional Forester. In other words, the Travel Plan decision was found to be consistent with NEPA, and associated regulations, laws and policies. The Forest Service signed an agreement with Gallatin County in 2010 to work towards resolution of long standing intermingled ownership issues associated with Bear Canyon. Regarding the portion of Bear Canyon Road and Trail #440 that the County asserts ownership on is whether or not the Forest Service and the State of Montana have the ability to regulate travel and manage the land. It is still disputed whether or not Gallatin County has certain rights on these routes as no easements exist in the public record. Thus the road, gate or signing were not in violation of county road easements or vandalism of county property. The new trail location has had additional reconstruction with rock blasting, a wider tread and numerous pullouts. The trail meets and exceeds National Forest trail standards for the uses allowed on the trail – foot, bicycle, motorcycle, ATV and equestrian.
4a	letter	Shelley Watters	11/15/2010	Cites illegal activities by Forest Service regarding gate and sign at Bear Canyon. Attached news article.	The Forest Service was within authorities regarding the placement of a gate and sign at Bear Canyon.
5	email	Steve Moore	11/8/2010	Cites erosion and muddy conditions with current closure dates	Your email of 11/08/10 and observations of the Trail #53 conditions to Bear Lakes and the trail to Mystic Lake is correct regarding current Bear Canyon trail conditions. The use of trails in Bear Canyon for motorized recreation will require trail rehabilitation to meet Gallatin NF trail standards before motorized use can use the area without additional trail damage. Many of the trail upgrades have been completed along the lower trail #440 system including the new trail alignment in Section 6 T3S R7E on the east side of Bear Creek, obliteration of the original trail on the west side, and improved drainage, new trail bridges, and improved trail surface durability in sections 7, 8, 9, 17, 20 of T3S R7E. The remainder of the Bear Canyon trail system is currently under contract to complete trail improvement work in sections 20, 21, 22, and 28 of T3S R7E. This additional trail upgrade will consist of improved drainage, trail surface puddle reduction, more durable subgrade, and rehabilitating and blocking unauthorized spur user made motorized ATV and motorbike routes. The new sections of rehabilitated trails will not be opened to public motorized use until all the trail improvements are completed. The incremental additional trail maintenance use from extending the season from October 15 – December 2 may require further maintenance such as spot gravelling, more drainage structure cleaning, and additional subgrade strengthening. The additional maintenance will be consistent with trail maintenance procedures discussed in the Travel Plan FEIS and ROD. Note that the trail from Bear Lakes to Mystic lake will be managed as non-motorized, although, as you pointed out, much of that trail needs drainage work.

Letter #	type of response	Name	Date	Comment	Forest Service Response
6	email	Elisabeth Mann	11/14/2010	Reason is damage to the trail; and hunters should walk	The travel plan decision identified standard 3-2 and 3-3 (page II-20 of the Detailed Description of the Decision) which would disallow trails # 40, #53 and # 508 from opening to anything except foot traffic until the reconstruction of these routes has mitigated undue soils and watershed concerns. This proposal does not relieve the FS of meeting that standard, and these routes will not be opened for motorized/mechanized use until restoration work on these trails is satisfactory. The proposed action would extend the season that motorized users could access the Bear Canyon Area through the general big game season. Motorized users are required to stay on the designated routes within the area. Portions of the drainage would still provide non-motorized hunting opportunities off of the designated motorized trail system. The travel plan decision also provided numerous areas nearby Bear Canyon where fall motorized use is prohibited during the general hunting season (e.g. most of the trails within the Bridgers, Bozeman Creek, upper Hyalite and the Gallatin Crest, Trail Creek, Chestnut Mountain, and all of the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study area).
7	email	James Allard	11/12/2010	Reason is damage to trail and he enjoys the "quiet".	Comment noted please see previous discussion.
8	email	Sally Hughes	11/12/2010	Cites protection of Bear Creek and ATV trail damage.	The travel plan decision identified standard 3-2 and 3-3 (page II-20 of the Detailed Description of the Decision) which would disallow trails # 440, #53 and #508 from opening to anything except foot traffic until the reconstruction of these routes has mitigated undue soils and watershed concerns. This proposal does not relieve us of meeting that standard, and these routes will not be opened for motorized/mechanized use until restoration work on these trails is satisfactory.
9	email	Patti Steinmuller	11/11/2010	Cites off-trail use and damage to wetlands, and likes "quiet trail".	The travel plan decision identified standard 3-2 and 3-3 (page II-20 of the Detailed Description of the Decision) which would disallow trails # 440, #53 and #508 from opening to anything except foot traffic until the reconstruction of these routes has mitigated undue soils and watershed concerns. This proposal does not relieve the FS of meeting that standard, and these routes will not be opened for motorized/mechanized use until restoration work on these trails is satisfactory. The travel plan decision emphasized motorized recreation and opportunities for mountain bikes in this area, this decision will not revisit the appropriate mix of uses in this drainage. We recognize that enforcement in this popular area has been of issue, and will continue to focus on appropriate signing, education and presence of law enforcement officer to ensure compliance. Resolution of jurisdictional issues in the lower sections of the #440 trail will help resolve the confusion the public may have over legally appropriate vehicles in the area.
10	letter	Mary Sadowski	11/10/2010	Concerns are erosion and resource damage, taxpayer dollars, land of enforcement and signage, limited parking and noise.	The travel plan decision identified standard 3-2 and 3-3 (page II-20 of the Detailed Description of the Decision) which would disallow trails # 440, #53 and #508 from opening to anything except foot traffic until the reconstruction of these routes has mitigated undue soils and watershed concerns. This proposal does not relieve the FS of meeting that standard, and these routes will not be opened for motorized/mechanized use until restoration work on these trails is satisfactory. The travel plan decision emphasized motorized recreation and opportunities for mountain bikes in this area, this decision will not revisit the appropriate mix of uses in this drainage. We recognize that enforcement in this popular area has been of issue, and will continue to focus on appropriate signing, education and presence of law enforcement officer to ensure compliance. Resolution of jurisdictional issues in the lower sections of the #440 trail will help resolve the confusion the public may have over legally appropriate vehicles in the area.
11	letter	Roy & Carol Metcalf, Remi & Susie Metcalf, Leland and Renee Thill	11/12/2010	Grazing permit holders that do not like the new trail #440 because it is dangerous for all users	The new trail provides an improved passage way and surface in which livestock can move through the canyon.
12	letter	Wally Bowery	11/15/2010	Notes that the change will provide good access for Montana sportsmen.	Comment noted.
13	letter	Barbara L. Aas, Geologist	11/9/2010	This trail should not have ANY motorized use allowed because of the clay soil. Cites 6 ft. deep bogs and heavy erosion.	We understand that Bear Canyon has heavy clay soils hence the extensive trail rehabilitation and maintenance that will be required to keep the trail up to GNF Travel Plan standards. Please also refer to the response comments above to Phil Knight and Steve Moore above.
13a	email	Barbara L. Aas, Geologist	11/9/2010	Same information as contained in letter of same date.	
14	letter	Ann de Meij	11/12/2010	Reasons are to protect wildlife. Cites the land formations are not suitable for motorized use.	Please refer to the response comments above to Phil Knight and Steve Moore above.
15	email	Anne Banks	11/11/2010	Cites unstable soil and earlier closure allows for snow to build up for better skiing and snowshoeing. Also notes safety concerns between motorized hunters and foot users.	The travel plan decision identified standard 3-2 and 3-3 (page II-20 of the Detailed Description of the Decision) which would disallow trails # 440, #53 and #508 from opening to anything except foot traffic until the reconstruction of these routes has mitigated undue soils and watershed concerns. This proposal does not relieve us of meeting that standard, and these routes will not be opened for motorized/mechanized use until restoration work on these trails is satisfactory. The travel plan decision emphasized motorized recreation and opportunities for mountain bikes in this area, this decision will not revisit the appropriate mix of uses in this drainage. Late fall use by motorized users would certainly not preclude skier use of this trail system, and may compact early snowfall allowing the snow to persist during warm spells. The design of the trail improves site distances and tread for all users thus reducing safety issues between motorized users and foot traffic

Letter #	type of response	Name	Date	Comment	Forest Service Response
16	email	Susie McDonald	11/20/2010	Cites muddy conditions and prolonged vehicle use could jeopardize Bear Creek, as well as unpleasant for hikers.	The travel plan decision identified standard 3-2 and 3-3 (page II-20 of the Detailed Description of the Decision) which would disallow trails # 440, #53 and #508 from opening to anything except foot traffic until the reconstruction of these routes has mitigated undue soils and watershed concerns. This proposal does not relieve the FS of meeting that standard, and these routes will not be opened for motorized/mechanized use until restoration work on these trails is satisfactory. The travel plan decision emphasized motorized recreation and opportunities for mountain bikes in this area, this decision will not revisit the appropriate mix of uses in this drainage.
17	email	Glenda Barnes	11/9/2010	Cites current damage from ATV traffic	Comment noted. Please refer to the response comments above to Phil Knight and Steve Moore above.
18	email	Linda Heisler	11/9/2010	Cites current damage from ATV traffic	Comment noted. Please refer to the response comments above to Phil Knight and Steve Moore above.
19	email	Joan Montagne	11/9/2010	Cites current damage from ATV traffic, along with erosion to the drainage	Please refer to the response comments above to Phil Knight and Steve Moore above.
20	email	Henri Foch	11/9/2010	His mountain biking on the trail has shown the damage that has already been done by OHV users. Cites erosion and dilapidated bridges. Would like to preserve the area for wintering elk.	The renovations that have been made to the trail system are intended to reverse most of the heavy damage that today's users have been experiencing. Bridges will span critical drainages, culverts will drainage minor drainages, turnpikes will lift trail over swampy areas, surface drainage will be added to remove water, and spot surfacing will be added as needed. The heaviest trail damage to Forest trails occurs in the spring and early summer when the subgrade is fully saturated from melting snows setting on the tread surface. The July 15th opening date allows the tread surface to drain and dry and is the primary mitigation for minimizing tread damage. Summer and fall rain storms wet the surface and run off and do not generally saturate subgrade and tend to dry within a day of the rains ending. Cold weather in the fall freezes the subgrade and makes a durable tread. This modification to the Travel Plan will not have an effect to wintering elk.
21	email	Judd Grunzke	11/9/2010	Enjoys motorized recreation and would like expanded opportunities	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
22	email	Karen Kaminski	11/9/2010	Reason is she is paying taxes to enjoy the beauty and notes damage from motorized use.	Comment regarding the beauty of the Bear Canyon area noted. This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon. The renovations that have been made to the trail system will reverse most of the heavy damage that today's users have been experiencing. Bridges will span critical drainages, culverts will drainage minor drainages, turnpikes will lift trail over swampy areas, surface drainage will be added to remove water, and spot surfacing will be added as needed. The heaviest trail damage to the Forest trails occurs in the spring and early summer when the subgrade is fully saturated from melting snows setting on the tread surface. The July 15th opening date allows the tread surface to drain and dry and is the primary mitigation for minimizing tread damage. Summer and fall rain storms wet the surface and run off and do not generally saturate subgrade and tend to dry within a day of the rains ending. Cold weather in the fall freezes the subgrade and makes a durable tread.
23	email	Pat Simmons	11/8/2010	Cites current damage from ATVs	Comment noted. See previous responses to Phil Knight, Steve Moore and Henri Foch.
24	email	Virginia Jenna Caplette	11/8/2010	Suggests expanding quiet Chestnut Mtn trail through Bear Creek	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized or non-motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
25	email	Sherrill Halbe	11/8/2010	Cites current damage from ATVs	Comment noted. See previous responses to Phil Knight, Steve Moore and Henri Foch.
26	email	Carolyn Hopper	11/8/2010	Cites current damage from ATVs, and notes that seasonal damage to streams will be expanded.	Comments noted. See previous responses to Phil knight, Steve Moore and Henri Foch.
27	email	Nate Delaney	10/25/2010	Would like to see expanded motorized opportunities	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon. See previous responses to Phil Knight, Steve Moore and Henri Foch.
28	email	Alex Russell	11/11/2010	Would like OHV traffic eliminated on trail #440. Notes spread of noxious weeds and motorized is incompatible with hunting, hiking and skiing.	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon. See previous responses to Phil Knight, Steve Moore and Henri Foch.
29	letter	Joanne Mannell Noel - Bear Canyon Road resident	11/7/2010	Cites deterioration of trail and parking area over last decade and decline in quality of life due to motorized use. Objects to any motorized use on trail #440.	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon. See previous responses to Phil Knight, Steve Moore and Henri Foch.
30	letter	Gail Richardson	11/6/2010	Cites ruts caused by ATVs. Would like FS to access trail condition after October 14	Comments noted. See previous responses to Phil Knight, Steve Moore and Henri Foch.
31	letter	Wendell Morrill	11/10/2010	Notes that there is an increased need for ATV trails due to increasing number of users.	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon. Appreciate your offer to volunteer.
32	letter	Carl Krob	11/4/2010	An extended season for ATVs and motorcycles is a good idea.	Comment noted.
33	letter	Esther Schwier	10/24/2010	Increased motorized use is detrimental to the quality of the trail for all other users.	Comment noted. See previous responses to Phil Knight, Steve Moore and Henri Foch.
33a	phone	Esther Schwier	10/29/2010	Phone call to reiterate the trail is unsuitable for extended motorized use.	Comment noted. See previous responses to Phil Knight, Steve Moore and Henri Foch.

Letter #	type of response	Name	Date	Comment	Forest Service Response
33b	letter	Esther Schwier	11/3/2010	Cites current closure is not enforced and trail is in appalling condition. Also cites safety as an issue because of trail width.	Comment noted. See previous responses to Phil Knight, Steve Moore and Henri Foch and others.
34	email	Dusti Hall	10/29/2010	Asks for additional projects that expand motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities.	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
35	email	Greg Beardslee	10/31/2010	Cites that trail stabilization must be substantial for extension of dates; and hopes we will monitor the extended use.	Comment noted. See previous responses to Phil Knight, Steve Moore and Henri Foch.
36	email	S D Turbitt	10/28/2010	Comment expressing support of the proposed extension of seasonal use of Trail #440 to motorized use. Commenter would also like additional information about projects that expand and enhance motorized use.	In response to your request for information about other proposals to expand/enhance motorized use there are none currently on the Gallatin National Forest. The annual Motor Vehicle Use Map displays where motorized use is allowed on the Forest, and the Gallatin National Forest Travel Management Plan Detailed Description of the Decision displays the desired future condition for all types of travel opportunity of the Forest's road and trail system. You can find these on the Gallatin National Forest website.
37	email	Sarah Light	10/27/2010	Comment expressing support for the proposed extension of seasonal use of Trail #440 to motorized use and stating that they would like to see more access to public owned land	In response to your comment about wanting to see more (motorized) access to public land, we're sure that you are aware that there is demand for both motorized opportunities and non-motorized opportunities in locations that are not open to motorized use. There are strong advocates on behalf of both these opportunities and it can make travel management decisions highly contentious. The Gallatin National Forest addressed this issue in 2006, after a 5 year process, by producing a Travel Management Plan. This can be viewed at the Gallatin National Forest website.
38	email	Joe Kuzmic	10/26/2010	Comment expressing support for the proposed extension of seasonal use of Trail #440 to motorized use.	Comment noted.
39	email	William Mosman	10/26/2010	would like to see more projects to expand motorized recreational opportunities	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
40	email	Barry Krayner	10/25/2010	Comment supporting the change to Trail #440, stating "after what you have done to the AMERICAN people who have to pay your salary so you can lock US OUT OF OUR PUBLIC land this is the least you can do.	We appreciate your feedback and are sorry about your feelings toward the Travel Plan. We're sure that you are aware that there is demand for both motorized opportunities and non-motorized opportunities in locations that are not open to motorized use. There are strong advocates on behalf of both these travel scenarios and it can make travel management decisions highly contentious. While there are a number of individuals who don't like it we believe that the Travel Plan struck the appropriate balance in accommodating the public as a whole and in providing for resource protection.
41	email	Mike Stevens	10/25/2010	would like to see more projects to expand motorized recreational opportunities	Comment noted. This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
42	email	D.J. Gardner	10/25/2010	make OHV access high priority	Comment noted. This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
43	email	Daniel Hall	20/24/2010	Comment expressing support for the proposed extension of seasonal use of Trail #440 to motorized use.	Comment noted.
44	letter	Francis J. Noel, III, Bear Canyon Road resident	10/27/2010	Cites environmental impact of motorized users and impact on neighborhood and trailhead parking lot. Opposed to all motorized use on the trail.	This proposal is not designed to revisit the Gallatin NF travel plan decision which designated most of the routes within the Bear Canyon drainage as open to motorized trail use. The proposed action is simply focused on the appropriate season of use once the trail reconstruction and mitigation measures are completed.
45	letter	Noreen Breeding	10/28/2010	Motorized use should be shortened or eliminated on the trail because it is not suitable for motorized. Notes the new resurfacing is inadequate. Travel plan designated this trail for skiing, and it is too steep and narrow	The renovations that have been are being made to the trail system will reverse most of the heavy damage that today's users have been experiencing. Bridges will span critical drainages, culverts will drainage minor drainages, turnpikes will lift trail over swampy areas, surface drainage will be added to remove water, and spot surfacing will be added as needed. The heaviest trail damage to the Forest trails occurs in the spring and early summer when the subgrade is fully saturated from melting snows setting on the tread surface. The July 15th opening date allows the tread surface to drain and dry and is the primary mitigation for minimizing tread damage. Summer and fall rain storms wet the surface and run off and do not generally saturate subgrade and tend to dry within a day of the rains ending. Cold weather in the fall freezes the subgrade and makes a durable tread.
46	letter	Kerry White, Citizens for Balanced Use	10/10/2010	Popular hunting area and has had historic motorized access. Cites the new trails in inadequate and dangerous.	Comments noted. See previous responses to Phil knight, Steve Moore and Henri Foch.
47	phone call	Charles Murtaugh	10/24/2010	Comment expressing support for the proposed extension of seasonal use of Trail #440 to motorized use.	Comment noted.
48	letter	R. A. Bellows	10/27/2010	Comment expressing support for the proposed extension of seasonal use of Trail #440 to motorized use but asking for clarification. (1) "It is not clear if the end use date of December 1 will exclude use of snow machines. If this is the case I urge consideration to allow use of snow machines after that date. (2) It is not clear to me how the begin use date of July 16 each year was arrived at. This is well beyond spring breakup and any frost leaving the ground. I urge consideration of using a date no later than July 1 as the begin use date.	Comment noted. Snowmobiles are excluded in the lower Canyon however use is allowed in the upper Canyon area through Goose Creek- see Forest Travel Plan map. The mid July opening date for trail use is to protect the trail facility since the Canyon tends to hold snow. This later date allows for snow melt and time for the trail to dry out.

Letter #	type of response	Name	Date	Comment	Forest Service Response
49	email	Dan Thompson, Ravalli County Off Road User Assoc.	10/23/2010	Would like us to expand OHV use on Forest	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
50	email	Rhonda Mumm	10/22/2010	Comment expressing support of the proposed extension of seasonal use of Trail #440 to motorized use. Commenter would also like additional information about projects that expand and enhance motorized, mountain bike and snowmobile recreation opportunities.	In response to your request for information about other proposals to expand/enhance motorized/mechanized opportunities there are none currently on the Gallatin National Forest. The annual Motor Vehicle Use Map displays where motorized use is allowed on the Forest, and the Gallatin National Forest Travel Management Plan Detailed Description of the Decision displays the desired future condition for all types of travel opportunity of the Forest's road and trail system. You can find these on the Gallatin National Forest website.
51	email	Kyle Kershaw and family	10/22/2010	Asks that we continue to consider off road motorcyclist opportunities.	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
52	email	Kay Hadland	10/22/2010	would like to see more projects to expand motorized recreational opportunities	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
53	email	Don Davies	10/22/2010	would like to see more projects to expand motorized recreational opportunities	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
54	email	Stan Mai	10/22/2010	would like to see more projects to expand motorized recreational opportunities	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
55	email	Gary Allard	10/22/1010	would like to see more projects to expand motorized recreational opportunities	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
56	email	John Alastra	10/22/2010	would like to see more projects to expand motorized recreational opportunities	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
57	email	Daryl Bender	10/22/2010	He would like removing the OHV restrictions on Trail #440	Comment noted.
58	email	Jeff Young	10/22/2010	He supports further similar projects	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
59	email	Lonnie Sturgis	10/22/2010	would like to see more projects to expand motorized recreational opportunities	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
60	email	Randy Noon	10/22/2010	would like to see more projects to expand motorized recreational opportunities	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
61	email	Northern Mono Chamber of Commerce	10/22/2010	would like to see more projects to expand motorized recreational opportunities	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
62	email	David Fowley	10/22/2010	would like to see more projects to expand motorized recreational opportunities	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
63	email	High Sierra Fishing	10/22/2010	would like to see more projects to expand motorized recreational opportunities	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
64	email	Fayette Latterell	10/22/2010	would like to see more projects to expand motorized recreational opportunities	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
65	email	Ken Dunn	10/22/2010	would like more motorized access	This proposal does not propose to revisit the overall configuration of open motorized routes within the Gallatin NF, it is simply confined to the season of use on Trail #440 in Bear Canyon.
66	letter	George Chopper	10/17/2010	is not satisfied with motorized use on any trail in the forest.	Comment noted.
67	letter	Mike Huschle	10/12/2010	Comment that the extension of the season of use would be okay and that they would like us to save money for the next trail rebuild and sign replacements	Comment noted.
68	letter	Gerald Orcholski	10/15/2010	does not support any motorized vehicles in the NF	Comment noted. This proposal does not intend to revisit the travel plan allocation of motorized uses on forest roads and trails, that decision was made after extensive public involvement. After extensive analysis a mix of recreation opportunities was found to be appropriate which included motorized recreation.
69	note	Monty Casebolt	no date	Comment that the Travel Plan for Trail #440 sounds like the perfect proposal.	Comment noted.
70	letter	Kim Kelsey	10/12/2010	Cites that motorized use impacts the quality experience of travel by foot	We recognize that non-motorized recreationists often feel the quality of their recreation experience is compromised by the presence of motorized users. The original travel plan decision emphasized motorized recreation in the Bear Canyon travel planning area, and this minor change to that decision will not change that emphasis. The travel plan decision provided ample opportunities across the forest (overall a 25% increase in non motorized trail opportunities outside of wilderness) for non motorized recreation.
71	letter	James Yocom	10/11/2010	Cites the expanded date will include hunting season and he likes to ATV to access hunting areas.	Comment noted.