

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/25/2025 5:15:10 PM

First name: Lorna

Last name: Rittenburg

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Comments regarding the North Fork only as this is where we live. It is hard for me to assess the impact of the proposed user capacity on the limiting attributes for the various sections without knowing the current visitor use numbers we are already experiencing to compare the impact on the orv and desired visitor experience.

I think dividing the NF scenic into 2 MSU's is a good idea but I am confused.

Why are you suggesting a user capacity of 450/day in MU 2 which is scenic and managed for solitude etc but 120 less a day in the recreation section which is being managed for recreation with less opportunities for solitude and more interaction with other people on the river. If the limits in the recreational section below Camas (330/day) are lower than in MU2 (450/day) why would the trigger be 60 boats a day passing Great Northern Flats in the recreational section and 20 passing Polebridge in the MU2. It is unclear to me

60 boats in a 8 hour day while sitting on the shore at GNF would be a boat approx every 5.5 minutes not an experience I would want in a recreational section of a wild and scenic river.

Would it not be wise to have MU2 be from Polebridge to Big Creek not Camas? If permits are eventually issued for MU1 and 2 then floaters with no permit will have to enter the river at Camas There is no infrastructure, bathrooms, parking, river access here for rafts. Providing these in a Wild and Scenic river corridor would definitely impact the scenic values of this beautiful wild spot in the valley.

I also try to imagine these user capacity limits on fecal waste in the river corridor given the lack of permanent bathrooms. Expecting day users in particular to dig a hole 200 feet from the river to bury fecal waste seems unlikely to happen to me, will they be required to carry a spade in the raft? Perhaps education, portable porta potties and maps at the river access points showing where these facilities are located may help. 330 to 450 people a day spending 5 to 7 hours on the river for 2 to 3 months has the potential to be a large amount of human faeces?

This is a point which should probably have been addressed in the public comment for Park visitation and the opening up of the Inside North Fork Road (INFR). The map shows that the (INRF) road dips into the WSR corridor below Polebridge and north of Logging Creek. There are sound restrictions mentioned for scenic segments. By opening up the Inside North Fork Road to vehicles which will include ATV, floaters and shore visitors will lose the experience of hearing natural sounds as the sound of these vehicles will definitely exceed those of the dishwasher (perhaps someone from the Park is reading this.)

The user capacity for MU1 is of interest as it fluctuates so much depending on water levels but I am sure on the calculations it has been assumed that the Border to Ford can only be rafted for about 6 weeks to 2 months of the year which then puts more pressure on the access point at Ford as the most Northern point to enter the river to raft.

I am concerned about the impact and visitor experience at Polebridge which is going to be the take out and put in for MU1 and 2. If permits are going to be required eventually for either sections all boats are going to have either enter or leave the river at this point. There is one bathroom here and only one boat can be pulled onto a trailer at a time at this access. Yet at the trigger point there could be potentially be 180 people (5 per raft/car) could be 36 boats, trailers cars etc taking out from MU1 plus 450 (5/raft/car) 90 boats trailers and cars etc putting in for MU2. On top of this you have cars parked that have no vehicle reservation and are hiking into the Park, and there is car camping going on. I feel this will not be a good visitor experience, will cause degradation of the river bank, and force more infrastructure which may or may not be allowed to happen. On top of this the Park is scoping the idea of opening up the Inside North Fork Road which will greatly increase the amount of through traffic. Polebridge is already overcrowded in the summer (not sure of the present visitor numbers to compare with what this proposal might do).

I also wonder if the Border has enough capacity for all the boats and trailer which could potentially be with 180

people/day maybe 36 boats a day? In addition there is already bank degradation happening up there will with boats being dragged across the gravel bar but again I don't know current user numbers.

I think in conclusion I am wondering if the triggers for user capacity are too higher and may impact the orv of the river when it comes to visitor experience without increasing the supporting infrastructure which is not permitted under the current CRMP?

Fisheries, Given the effects of climate change on water flow and temperature superimposed on the increase in visitation and fishing I wonder if the triggers have not already been met and management actions should not already be implemented? There could also be a tightening up the fishing regulations to increase the survivability of fish returned to the river. e.g no barbs, no 3 pronged hooks and education on how hold and return caught fish to the river. Out of the scope of the CRMP but why are lead weights still used in the rivers of the Park and National Forest. They are known to accumulate in the bodies and kill birds feeding on fish caught using lead weights.

I hope some of these insights might be useful.

Lorna