

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/7/2025 10:53:26 PM

First name: Deb

Last name: Starling

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for the consideration on comments.

I would like to have you consider an alternative option to no dogs in the Middle Fork Section as described. I believe there are several floaters that have dogs that come with them out of the wilderness section that continue on to lower stretches. It seems unreasonable to ask for none, especially this section that is a slower pace and condition and many are just floating for fishing or joy. Animals bring that as well. It could be worded more like the language at Jewel Basin making sure your animal is under control at all times or if offshore a leash required. This is not 100% in the park, so should not be more restrictive. Another option instead could include in the river guide no stopping on the park shore in stretch a to b with a dog. How does this compare what is allowed at the Goat Lick site for the public to view wildlife that is 100% in the park? This proposed action could be very precedent setting as prepared for national forest lands.

I am concerned that human waste and sanitation are not better addressed in the North Fork. Where there are outhouses, they are utilized and sought by floaters. I don't believe the current plan does prohibit them in the Scenic Section, but managers have chosen not to add due to maintenance workload. I suggest adding an outhouse at Coal Creek, Sonderson and at Wurtz. People will walk to them as long as they know where they are, they are not needed to be visible from the shore. You don't have to have a developed site to have an outhouse.

I have a concern the process changed from how it was shared as in the public meetings multiple time with the public. The CRP was shared that it would be prepared and approved. Then other management tools may be utilized. I wonder if there is really a need for an updated CRP. The plan from 1987 era had the ability to have specific action taken if monitoring showed a need. Maybe the funds being utilized for an updated plan need to just be utilized for additional on the ground presence. I understand the current plan does not use some of the language like ORV's, but does describe them just the same. There is something very special about a river system that is not being under a permit system, and it seems like that is missing in the mix of proposed actions.

Related to the need to phase in a mandatory permit system for all river segments and users over time, I question how there is staff available to make this happen when at this time it is not an option to come and stop by the Hungry Horse Ranger Station, as the door has been closed for the public. I would guess if you call in advance and make an appointment, you can come. But if traveling public wants to stop and ask questions at Hungry Horse or at Spotted Bear stations, and all there is, is info on bulletin boards, that is not service or giving time for different styles the public users might best relate with. I am very concerned that the South Fork is the out of the chute first. To my knowledge there is no internet service at any of the trailheads leading into the wilderness, so if users see this for the first time as they get to trailhead after a long travel time, they will likely go anyway. I would also ask how land parties in the wilderness that just might want to have a portion float a short section and then resume their trail route would have a permit. I've seen many that would float just a ¼ to ½ mile, as examples: in the Schafer Meadows are, Big Prairie, Hahn Creek, White River area, Gordon Creek, Salmon Fork, Sonderson and Wurtz in the NF. How does a permit for this use happen? If acquired in advance, good chance dates are off due to travel changes, weather etc. as how does a permit happen? Again, I'd think of employees, partners and volunteers based out of Big Prairie or Schafer or other locations, how would they get permits or are they exempt? As this is implemented on the other sections, how are landowners that access the river not at existing sites, but from their own land required to have a permit? This is not a closed river with very limited access points. There are many throughout out the three segments.

I think party size is a better management tool at this time for all segments. .

I appreciate the chance to comment.