

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/3/2025 11:31:15 PM

First name: Jim

Last name: Rittenburg

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My comments will be concise and limited to the North Fork of the Flathead River:

- good to divide the NF of the Flathead river into MU1 and MU2 for scenic and a separate Recreation segment to the south
- Camas bridge may not be the best boundary choice between scenic and recreation since this is not an established put in or take out spot. Would make more sense to use Big Creek as the boundary
- The proposed user capacities do not seem to match the desired uses of MU1, MU2 and the recreation segment. It would make more sense for user capacities to be lowest for MU1 and next lowest for MU2 and highest for the Recreation segment of the river. You are currently proposing that MU2 has a higher user capacity (450 vs 330) than the Recreation segment of the river.

For multiday float trips, "pack in and pack out" including human waste should be instilled through education, particularly at the put in sites. Groovers should be required so that the shoreline does not become littered with human waste and toilet paper.

Triggers and thresholds are hard to comment on without any historical data. Monitoring boats passing Ford will be very influenced by the monitoring date. Since the section of the river from the border to Ford becomes very low during the back half of the summer the number of large rafts will naturally decrease greatly during August depending upon weather patterns in any particular year. July 4th week, and the month of July in general would be the best period for monitoring at Ford boats going past Ford.

Work with GNP to enforce noise limits, particularly related to side by side motor vehicles that tend to have very loud exhaust systems. The inside NF road is close to the rivers in some places and the scenic experience is negatively impacted by loud vehicles driving near the side of the river.