From: Hunteman, Jeff -FS
To: Milligan, Joshua O -FS; Schick, Jessica - FS
Subject: FW: Comments for SCNFFPR
Date: Friday, March 1, 2019 6:53:34 AM
Attachments: image001.png

Fyi and to add

Jeffrey J Hunteman
NEPA Planner

Forest Service
Salmon-Challis National Forest

p: 208-756-5246

jeff.hunteman@usda.gov

1206 S Challis St.
Salmon, ID 83467

Caring for the land and serving people

From: Marti Bingham [mailto:martflyingresort@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 4:21 PM
To: Hunteman, Jeff -FS <jhunteman@fs.fed.us>
Subject: Comments for SCNFFPR

Hi – I work with Tammy at the Flying Resort Ranches and would like to submit comment for the Wilderness Evaluation.

On a work level I would like to address the concerns of accessing the Frank Church Wilderness. We have limited access into the wilderness from the east side of the Middle Fork River as it is now. In 2018 the Camas Creek trail became non passable and we literally could not go into or out of the wilderness with stock. After some time an alternate route was opened and we were able to move our animals through Yellowjacket. That access point is very limited by weather, water levels and is not a trail for beginners. Other access points, as we found out, such as the Bighorn Craigs, Stoddard Pack Bridge/Trail or Loon Creek are not options during the summer season or some – not at all. I do not want to see any less access points.

The roads into the starting of the trails needs to be seriously considered. We have to have access to Meyer's Cover and the Camas Creek area for vehicles to get our stock into and out of the ranch not to mention the homes and property that people have in that area. Morgan Creek, Williams Creek /Deep Creek and Panther Creek are the 3 roads we have the choice of using and each one is unique and needed depending on weather and the seasons.

On these points – I would be against adding more Wilderness area adjacent to the already

Frank Church Wilderness. Area #11 is a critical access area for stock users and hikers to get to the Middle Fork River and hunting areas.

On a personal level – I have grown up in the Salmon area personally using the forests for camping, 4-wheeling, hunting and riding horses. We do not need more wilderness area. I see the Frank Church Wilderness and the restrictions it has on it on a daily basis at work and feel that the wilderness is not anything I would want in my backyard.We have enough regulations and rules on the forest we use now. I see absolutely no benefit to adding more acreage and rules to an already minimally used wilderness. We live in the Salmon area and have chose to raise our kids here in part because of the forest and easy access. We use year round many areas in the #12, #7, #16 proposed Focal Areas.

#14 proposed area includes Salmon's watershed. How could it even be considered in a wilderness plan. That area will need to be accessed and maintained for many future generations.

Wild fire fighting and control – as we have watched in the Frank Church Wilderness the let it burn policy I can't imagine any of the proposed area (yellow or purple on the map) to be managed with that philosophy.

As I write this opposition letter to any newly added wilderness for business and personal reasons I can feel myself getting upset at the notion. I cannot imagine what benefit it would bring the government to add more wilderness other than financial. It would allow an already deteriorating trail and road system to become non-existent and as I see it shut down access to this area I love.

Thank you for considering and allowing my comments.

Marti Bingham
(208) 756-6295