

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/8/2025 5:29:58 AM

First name: Christopher

Last name: Rost

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Regarding free permits for all segments: the management idea is sound but how will that be implemented? The paperwork aspect of permitting will require personnel time and data management. How will this be budgeted? If you mandate a permit system but can't follow through because of budgetary constraints I fear it will not provide the management data collection or resource protection for which it is designed.

Regarding the regulation to prohibit motor vehicle parking on gravel bars: this is one of the best ways to minimize hydrocarbons leaking out of motor vehicles into our waterways. However, this requires some serious logistics. Where will people park? There is nowhere near enough parking for the proposed user capacities in the Middle Fork. Currently there are not enough NFS law enforcement officers in the area to enforce this. A regulation without enforcement is practically useless.

Regarding solid human waste management: Hope is not an action plan. Humans are reliably lazy and inconsiderate. Proposed user capacities and notoriously noncompliant visitors will eventually be disastrous to our water quality. The 200 foot rule might as well be 200 miles as people will not bother with it. They will continue to poop 20 feet from the shore and not bother to pack it out. We need stiff fines. We need the commercial raft companies to be required to have wag bags and/or groovers even on day trips.

Regarding the fire pan/blanket mandate: Consistency throughout all areas is important. How will this be enforced? Rules without enforcement capability are useless.

Regarding the MU1 limit on dogs and no-stopping expansion perimeter: Bravo. But why is the dog rule limited to this area only? Are we sacrificing wildlife everywhere else? Why are some wildlife worth sacrificing?

Regarding user capacities in general: I understand there is a complex formula used in this determination and ORVs are the guiding principle. I am concerned with the fact we have not reached our full stated user capacity in the Middle Fork or North Fork, but I have already observed degradation of many ORVs. If we do not initially set a more conservative user capacity it will be a long a difficult process to 1. reduce the capacity after the ORV threshold has been red-lined and 2. repair the damage to the ORVs from over-use. I would encourage the user capacities to be reconsidered for much lower numbers. It's always easier to start out firmly and then ease up than it is to start out softly and try to tighten up later. The resource (ORVs) is more important than some private company's bank account. We are already seeing damage being done... by definition I think the management plan suggests a reduction in user capacity is already in order. Who is going to fund the legal defense of the CRMP when environmental groups litigate because this plan didn't do what it said it would do?