Name of Draft Review Commenter	Description of Comments Submitted to Rawlins Field Office	BLM RFO Response to Public Comment
Kevin S. Bland John W. Haefeli Dan Wheeler Charles A Sanger Mike Frick Crystal Founds Walker Ranson Brad Boyer Lester Duke John Birnbaum Chris Fisher Greg Wheeler Heather Padoven Linda Carlson Mike Shoop Robert A Ruyle Walter Hatchett	Comment Description #C001: Opposition to formerly proposed bridge across French Creek and new river access road to Big Creek Undeveloped Recreation Site	RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR001: In response to public comments and additional BLM internal review, the Preferred Alternative has been changed to be the same as the No Action/Existing Condition Alternative for Big Creek Undeveloped Recreation Site (see Key Action 7 in Table 2 of the revised NPRRAMP EA).
Debbie Hindman	Comment Description #C002: Consider the comments suggested at the Chamber of Commerce Meeting.	RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR002: Please see the revised alternatives within Table 2 of the NPRRAMP EA (pg. 14).

Avery Cox Luke White Melanie Glenn Emily Moore	See Comment Descriptions #C001 and C002	Please reference above responses: RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR001 and RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR002.
Jill and Andy Bland RJ Farr Leon R. Hetherington John Banach Paul Pastina David J. Pedersen Frannie Parkinson Doffermyre Virginia Shannon Sheppard Smith Palmer Brown Charlie Marrs Bobbie McIntyre Wyn Bowden Emily Spear Hurst Williamson Laurie Jean Weil Pat Spetz Erika Wool Rachel Creagan Estella Munroe Tim DeWitt Rick Crawford Alexandra Zisser Colleen Ball Amy Astle-Raaen Cindy Sheptow J. Gray McCrickard Cheairs Porter Barrett Feltus	See Also Comment Descriptions #C001 and C002 Comment Description #C003: Please consider the affect that a potential increase in the volume of boaters would have on the resource. Please do not add additional commercial boating permits.	NPRRAMPEA-CR003: The Preferred Alternative for Key Action 3 was changed from 6 to 3 new Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) considered every other year (see Table 2, pg. 15, in NPRRAMP EA). Also, a 15 year SRP growth projection model is now provided in Figure 5b of the revised NPRRAMP EA. This model forecasts the number of encounters from Bennett Peak to Treasure Island based on the predicted future private and commercial craft launched and/or encountered at Bennett Peak (pg. 83). It is forecasted that over the 15 year duration of this plan the addition of 6 new SRPs would not exceed the Middle Country limit of an average of 22 craft encounters. The entire SRMA is currently classified as a Middle Country Recreation Setting (since 1985) and has objectives and guidelines under that classification for social and resource conditions (see Appendix C of the NPRRAMP EA on pgs. 102-104). Please also reference above responses: RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR001 and RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR002.

Mamie Belle
Todd Skalberg
Patricia L. Reilly
Finley Hines
Annie Feltus
Joe Farmer
Kristine Hooker
David R Boyd, Jr.
Mark Dunning
Manager, Big Creek
Ranch
Allie Eichorn
Judith Thompson
Gray Huffard
Debbie Huffard
Sandra Kiely
Tate Huffard
Matthew Koschak
Andrew Erker
Macie Walker
Ginny McClinton
Benjamin Heltzel
Yannick Young
William Strazza
Henry Clark
Laurette Duke
Robbie Gfeller
Parker Rankin
Lane Varner
Kyle Hartman

Susan Michalakes R.D. Farr Stan Banach Therese Brown Andy R. Farr Paul Irish Lisa Farr	See only Comment Description: #C003	See only Comment Response #: NPRRAMPEA-CR003
Cassidy Ziegler Francie Friddell Grant L. Weaver Regina McClinton Annie McEwen Hannah Dillard Jennifer Jaworsky Conner Harris Ginny Jurgensen Nicole McPheeters Charlie Shoop Caroline Pembroke Robert Lovato Ellis Mansfield Lyles Glenn Susan Brown Mike Reed Frances Glenn Leslie Fagan Farr Jeff M. Carron Alex McCrickard Leah Koehn Mary Miller Griffin Bruce Gallagher	See Also Comment Descriptions #C001 , C002, and #C003 Comment Description #C004: The construction and/or maintenance of roads would cause pollution/contamination of the fishery on the North Platte River.	NPRAMPEA-CR004: The Preferred Alternatives in the current revised Draft NPRRAMP EA provide for road maintenance to include erosion control (i.e., water bars and the filling of depressions) on Prospect Creek Road. This type of road maintenance would reduce sedimentation into the North Platte River rather than contribute to additional “pollution” or contamination of the river. Due to the lack of erosion control, Prospect Creek drainage currently does not meet the BLM’s Upper North Platte Watershed Standards and Guidelines Assessment. Please also reference above responses: RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR001 and RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR002, and NPRRAMPEA-CR003

Tricia Class
Dane Harbaugh
Peter Baer
Elizabeth P. Walters
M. Blake Carron
Genevieve Guyol
John D. Farr(#1)

Mitch Bangert	Again thank you for all of your attentions and for opening up the public comment period to the 2nd of June. In your interview with Bigfoot Radio today it was obvious you heard the concerns, and you acted accordingly and fairly, thank you again. I would support your option #3 in the letter you sent out yesterday the 21rst ….. " #3 … get a group of folks (more than likely our cooperating agencies at first) back together to re-visit those parts of the plan that warrant it." I would also volunteer and be privileged to offer you my time and efforts to be one of those folks… because … I have a unique experience and viewpoint on your proposals. I've been lucky and fortunate enough to travel and fish extensively throughout the Rocky Mountain West since 1979, and the world for that matter, and have seen, first hand, what unfettered access can do to a fishery and the experience on those rivers. I don't think we're depriving anyone of their experience on this small section of river from Bennett Peak to the confluence of Big Creek on the Platte …… once again it's the scarcity	Please also reference above responses: RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR001 and RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR002, NPRRAMPEA-CR003, and NPRAMPEA-CR004

	of easy access that has protected this stretch of river. As always, I'm available to be part of your sounding board process … not because of my viewpoint or too push my viewpoint … but for my experience on these Western waters that I'm happy to share with the BLM. So in closing, Your option #3 and please take advantage of my years out here as an enthusiastic fisher person and then as a professional outfitter.	
Roger Lynn	Thank you for meeting again with the public and opening up yourself and the BLM to the concerns of the Saratoga valley. Option #3 having further talks before making decisions is a good way to go. As for my concerns to all this they are as follows: 1) Do you and others at the BLM realize that after a certain point of water cfs (another words the amount of water, cubic feet per second) the day trip from Big Creek to Bennett is not possible? Do you and others know what this level is? By me saying "not possible", I mean one would have to get out of the boat and push and pull (drag) their boat for over 80% of the trip. And if the wind is blowing the other 20% would not have enough water to flow a boat forward. Consideration needs to be given to the safety of those individuals who would not know this. (That would be 97% of the people	WGFD staff were consulted including fisheries habitat biologists. Please also reference above responses: RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR001 and RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR002, NPRRAMPEA-CR003, and NPRRAMPEA-CR004

using the given BLM access). Not to mention the private property they would have to go through. Even though I know the law states access needs to be give to those on rivers classified as portable. Opening the Big creek access you are inviting confrontation between the public and Sangers ranch. Does the BLM have the man power to supervise this?
2) Does the BLM know how important the upper fishery is to the health of the river. Because the river is not accessible for 10 months out of the year the fishery is able to sustain itself. If, people start disrupting this fishery it will stress the fish further than the environment already does. And, do not forget this fishery for years has not been stocked. It is a wild fishery. At least according to our government agencies.
3) Has the BLM received any opinions from the Game and Fish Biologists? What is their opinion since having more people on the fishery will effect it and the Fish and Game will be left to answer to the public.
4) Giving more permits. I know your under a lot of pressure (especially from Brush Creek) to have access to the river but opening up this access does not relieve what is already happening on the river. Tuff decisions for you that I know will be made over your head since the pressure, (especially from Brush Creek) will become political. Good Luck on that one!

With all this said, you are truly making a decision on the last inaccessible river system left in the lower 48 states. And if you think about it, how long has the Saratoga valley been

accessing this system? Is it really that inaccessible? Why not just improve what is already there. Upgrading Bennett, updating the eastern side of Douglas creek. Do not touch the western side, the BLM has never seen fit to improve it in years past because of Eagle nest and other environmental reasons so just let it the way it is.

At 49 years of age I have come to know that everything changes and most every time not for the better. And the BLM gets put in the middle to make some of those decisions. Look at what the consequences are going to be because the BLM has allowed Fracking on public lands. Please consider on improving what is already there and managing it for the betterment of the environment and the people. By you expanding the consequences will be just like other western rivers of the Lower 48 states where public access has been opened up. Trust me, the fishing on the Smith river in Montana is not near as good as it was in the 80's when I went to college there and fished it. Arkansas river, the quality of fish there is not what it was now that all access is open. The same will be said of the Upper North Platte if further access is opened.

Brian Salazar	I'm writing in regards to your proposed changes to the recreational opportunities along the North Platte River specifically the road to allow access on BLM land on French creek and then to Big Creek Campground. I am opposed to this proposal. This will cause a big jump in traffic and more people and really take away from this beautiful area. Adding more access brings more people and really takes away from the natural beauty of the area. I feel the current access and roads more than suffice the needs to people in this area while still allowing the environment to stay wild. With regards to fishing, the number of wade fisherman should be accounted for in this area not just drift boat outfitters. This change would increase fishing pressure and really hurt this amazing stretch of river. This stretch of the North Platte is very special and I would hate for it to lose its one of a kindness. Everything feels so untouched and pristine here. With the proposed change, this stress of the N Platte would eventually become another fishing commodity. WE HAVE SOMETHING VERY UNIQUE NOW, why ruin that…? I am also wondering why there has not been any information about the scope of this project over the past few years. I am strongly opposed to the proposed change. I would hate to see something so natural and amazing turn into another outfitters haven with more disruption.	For comment concerning Big Creek see also above Response # RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR001. The BLM and NPRRAMP Sounding Board support using "watercraft encountered" for the planning purposes of this EA. The BLM may consider adding non-boating users in future counting methods. A description of scoping is provided in Chapter V under Summary of Scoping on pg. 11 of the NPRRAMP EA. The RAMP received extensive external scoping and public involvement from 2009 to present.

Debbie Hindman	Thank you so much for listening to my better half, Mitch Bangert with Harrison's Guest House & Guide Service. Mitch and I have been together for 21 years and quite frankly I've never met anyone with better perception of the wild world of rivers or more love for them. He has seen so many, as have I while at his side, river areas be punished by over use and abuse .. and never be able to recover from it. I would take him up on his offer of being one of the people that helps in revising the RAMP ... if you do indeed go with your 3rd option ... which with all the concern being shown would only make sense and I would choose. Mitch speaks highly of your open minded approach to his comments .... even if he did come a bit late to the table (he's a crazy busy guy with 4 companies to run) I think he could be a valuable resource and partner for the BLM going forward.	The BLM RFO has considered all meeting discussions and written comments.
Daniel Kenah	As a river user, from fisherman to raft guide, I think that government agencies like BLM and the forest service need to seriously reconsider plans to expand river traffic. As a guide on the Snake River I see every summer the expansion of river traffic both commercially and	Please reference above responses: RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR001, RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR002, NPRRAMPEA-CR003, and NPRAMPEA-CR004. There will be a National Public Lands Day held on Sept. 28, 2013 to organize volunteers to provide upgrades to the maintenance condition of

privately. As much as I'm excited to share a beautiful place and a personal passion with more people, I also know that our stretch only stays clean and orderly because of the efforts of a relatively small but very local, very concentrated group of people devoted to the Snake's conservation. Having enjoyed the North Platte and Big Creek for two summers I know that that particular area is not as well endowed with such a strong local contingent to sponsor clean-up days and raise money for maintenance and care. As it is, I see the expansion of its use as negative thing, depleting a scarce resourse rarely considered - remoteness and solitude - without the proper wherewithall to curb the inevitable externalities of that expansion.
This is a larger issue to me than this one confluence. It's a trend to supply people wanting more "stuff," in which I include thoughtless consumption and even minor destruction to provide easier access to wild areas. This trend is to supply the immediate needs without proper consideration of the long-term effects, which is unfortunately epidemic in our society. This move to accomodate more people by providing one resource - waterways and access thereto - comes at the cost of more abtract resources like remoteness. Wyoming is relatively abundant in that resource, but it should not be spent carelessly.
"God bless Wyoming, and keep it wild."

Corral Creek Campground.

Dennis (and Julie) Smith	I am a fly fisherman and nature enthusiast. I have had the great pleasure to fish the upper North Platte watershed, both its public and private waters, for almost twenty years for one to four weeks per year (I am a Floridian and travel to Wyoming specifically for this purpose). The quality of this fishery and the wildlife encountered are directly related to the relative lack of intrusion by large numbers of people and commercial interests. I have learned of a proposal that would increase access to this regional by building additional roads and/or boat ramps. This proposal concerns me greatly because of its inevitable impact on not only the fishing but also the other fauna and flora of the area. As notes of proof, please consider the following commentary: -I have developed a habit of collecting "man trash" every time I fish. Through the years, I have observed a direct correlation between the amount of human trash and water levels. I initially found this curious, but it has gradually dawned on me that the high water allows commercially guided float trips through reaches of the river normally "off limits" to all people except for those willing to tackle the challenges created by a lack of roads and boat ramps. During a typical two week trip that takes place during low water, my "collection" maybe fills 50% of my net; during high water, high traffic, easy access times, the volume swells to fill 1.5 to 2 of the 18x14x12 inch boxes I use to pack my gear for air travel. I can only imagine the destruction to the	Please reference above responses: RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR001, RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR002, NPRRAMPEA-CR003, and NPRAMPEA-CR004. Impacts to wildlife, fisheries, and vegetation are described and considered in the Environmental Consequences section, Chapter VIII, of the NPRRAMP EA (pgs. 33-66). Littering effects on the North Platte River SRMA would be mitigated if the Preferred Alternative were selected under Key Action 2 (Leave-No Trace-Education).

	quality of the experience if this increased access occurs year around, every year, regardless of water levels. -When I first fell in love with Wyoming, my wife and visited several different watersheds, including the famous areas of the Snake, Jackson, Yellowstone, the Miracle Mile, and Gray's Reef area of the North Platte. While fishing was usually good to outstanding, we gradually gave up these trips and retreated to the confines of the upper North Platte because there was NO COMPARISON between the overall experiences…why? Because the human traffic into the other regions denigrates the richness of the visit. These areas are all very accessible by boat and automobile. Increasing access to the upper North Platte will significantly adversely impact this area and result in people like my wife and me being forced to into a new remote area. We greatly value the relatively remote situation that currently exists in this watershed; increased access can ONLY be a negative influence.	
Sandra Eike	As an outdoor person who hikes and fishes a great deal of the summer, I am terribly concerned over your proposal for increased access to the upper North Platte River. This area is quite remote; new roads, boat ramps, and increased traffic would only be a detriment	Please reference above responses: RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR001, RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR002, NPRRAMPEA-CR003, and NPRAMPEA-CR004. Mitigation for trespass concerns is proposed under the Preferred Alternative to provide informational signs at the Bennett Peak kiosk

	to the lovely pristine area and the wildlife living there. The North Platte River is already accessible with ample boat ramps and access areas. There is no need to further destroy Wyoming beauty. Most hikers, hunters, fishermen, outdoors men in general, are good stewards of the land. However, some are not. By making remote areas more accessible you would be encouraging exploitation: overuse of the land, trash both in the river and on new trails made by 4-wheel vehicles, trespassing and general misuse. Please reconsider the proposal for boat ramps and roads on the upper North Platte, especially the confluence of Big Creek and the North Platte.	concerning trespass and portaging along the river.
Paul Newman, High Plains Drifter LLC.	My name is Paul Newman, I am a Wyoming native, University of Wyoming alumni (bachelor's degree in Wildlife and Fisheries Biology and management), and I have seven years of experience guiding on the North Platte River I have worked for several outfitters: Hack's Tackle, North Platte Lodge, and Cowboy Drifters. I have recently started my own guide service, High Plains Drifter, which is an equal opportunity provider. I am on the SRP waiting list as well, the result of this EA greatly influences the future of my business and life. I love to guide, however, up and till this point it has been more of a lifestyle than a career path. This letter is in response to the	The BLM acknowledges your support of the Corral Creek river access. The Preferred Alternative in the Revised EA, if selected, would provide for this access through Special Recreation Permits (SRPs). The BLM also acknowledges your support for Wyoming residents being the only group considered for SRPs. However, there is no provision in the BLM's SRP Handbook (H-2930-1) for this type of action. The BLM is a federal agency and does not discriminate SRP applications based on residency. The BLM does not provide for state taxation of outfitters or reporting for this purpose. We understand your support providing permits to those without private land access. However, there is no provision in the BLM's SRP Handbook for this type of action. The BLM does discriminate SRP applications based on private land ownership.

Bureau of Land Management, Recreation Area Management Plan RAMP on the North Platte River.

In response to key action #3 Special Recreation Permitting (SRP). I support the objective stated by the BLM under Purpose on pages 4 and 5 specifically the two bulleted items: “Provide high quality recreation opportunities, especially for floating, fishing, camping and sightseeing” and “Pursue access opportunities to the North Platte River”. I assume high quality recreation opportunities means providing the public with trained, knowledgeable and passionate guides, which are available to the entire public. I would also assume that the access opportunities the BLM is pursuing would be of benefit to the entire public. Are my assumptions accurate?

I believe permit holders should have more than just CPR certification and insurance. When someone hires a guide, I think they expect that the person is passionate about what they do and knowledgeable about the area and the river. I believe that it is tough to be knowledgeable about a river that is in a state which you do not reside. It is my opinion that all SRP holders should be Wyoming residents. It is my opinion that guests of our state would like to float with people that live in Wyoming not other guests. I would also consider this a natural resource of Wyoming, and believe that revenue should be taxed in Wyoming. I am asking that all future SRP applicants be Wyoming residents.

Looking at the list of current businesses permitted through the BLM you will see that all of the major ranches/resorts (that own land

along the river) hold permits with the exception of Brush Creek Resort and Spa. Their use on BLM land seems to be minimal, as most of their boats launch at private boat launches. If they already have access to the river via private land why do they even need a permit for public land? Well to me it is simple economics. If they control all the access for commercial use then completion remains low and business good.

There is rumor that the old Sanger ranch might be sold to Brush Creek Resort and Spa. It is my opinion that this factor alone would have more of a negative impact on this pristine resource, more than anything the BLM is proposing. Sending dozens of inexperienced guides and guests wading in the river that have no knowledge of river etiquette. I have ran into it before on the river. Floating the North Platte above Bennett peak you often run into guests staying at A bar A. Some are polite but most are smug and act as if you are intruding. This is a shame to the sport, just because you are fortunate enough to have the opportunity to stay at one of these places, does not give you priority over everyone else. If Brush Creek does indeed by the Sanger Ranch than there is no more secluded public land, and I believe that encounters of the sort mentioned earlier would get worse.

I support all the proposed access and campgrounds. I believe these would be great attributes to the river and could encourage more people to come visit. I also support Coral Creek boat launch, this would be an excellent

way to disperse river traffic and has my full support.

In response to a statements by Mr. McGrath of Brush Creek Ranch and Spa regarding key action 7 Big Creek improvements. If BCR is indeed buying the Sanger Ranch then I could see why they would not want improvements right above the ranch. Mr. McGrath stated is his comment submitted to the BLM that "It seems to make sense that priority be given to business that have the most logical need and can provide the most and best service to the public." It seems obvious to me that BCR does not care about the general public. Their stance on the issues show me that they are concerned with providing their guests with an elite experience of fishing water the rest of the public cant access. On top of that they want to use public land for their business as well. I am against issuing SRP to large private resorts, that already have ample private river access.
In regard to a comment already submitted by Mitch Bangert with Harrison's guest house. As a chamber of commerce member I would hope that Mitch would be interested in opportunities that benefit the community. While his stance on this issue seems to be the opposite.
I disagree with Mr. Bangert's statement that improved access will make a crowded less enjoyable river. The upper North Platte River is one of the toughest venues in the west to guide and float. Almost all the shuttles require substantial driving time both put in and take out. The majority of these roads being dirt

	washboard roads. The Green, Arkansas and other rivers mentioned by Mr.Bangert, all have paved roads, short floats and short shuttles. The characteristics of the North Platte both logistics and terrain, make me believe that the resource will never be like that of other western rivers. One last point I would like to make. Regulation seems to be ineffective without enforcement. I have floated the North Platte River to many times to count, and I have never seen a BLM officer on or near the river. I have however, seen countless guides operating illegally without SRP on BLM lands. Things are changing on the North Platte River, the results of this EA will have an affect on the river and community for years to come. I sincerely hope that the BLMs idea of "high quality recreation" is permitting high quality guides, rather than private; high end dude ranches, lodges, resorts, and clubs. Which most of the public simply cannot afford.	
Chris Cheek	I am writing to express my opposition to the improvements proposed for the North Platte watershed. Furthermore, I would like to be directed to any environmental assessments or environmental impact statements connected with these proposals. If no environmental impact statement was prepared, please direct me to the finding of no significant impact for these proposals. As a river user, hiker, and fisherman, I am opposed to actions in the upper	Please reference above responses: RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR001, RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR002, NPRRAMPEA-CR003, and NPRRAMPEA-CR004 You may view all NEPA documents for the NPRRAMP (including the proposed EA and FONSI) at: http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/info/NEPA/documents/rfo/n_platte_ramp.html

	North Platte watershed that would increase traffic and river access. I value the relatively remote nature of this stretch of the river and do not want to see increased access or traffic. I am particularly opposed to the construction of any new roads in this area. Thank you for your attention to this important matter.	
Michael J. Lincoln	Thank you for supplying the additional informational meeting in Saratoga on May 16, 2013 and the subsequent opportunity to unofficially comment on the upcoming North Platte RAMP decisions. My opinions and suggestions are founded in being a local area resident and an Upper North Platte River recreational user since 1990, along with personal experiences at other similar-use rivers in Wyoming, Colorado, and Montana. I have witnessed the ever-increasing use of the Upper North Platte River for twenty-four years. After attending the May 16 meeting in Saratoga, I would like to urge you to select only the following alternative in order to alleviate the current issues of overcrowding at the Bennett Peak boat ramp: •For Key Action No.4 (Additional Parking Lot and Boat Ramp at the Bennett Peak Camp Ground) - please select .the Preferred Alternative wherein an overflow parking lot is	The BLM acknowledges your support of the Preferred Alternative for Key Action 4. The BLM acknowledges your support of the No Action/Existing Condition Alternatives for Key Action 3, 5, 6, and 7. The BLM would continue to monitor social and resource conditions to determine whether objectives for the SRMA are being met. If social and resource conditions approach exceedances of these objectives, the BLM would provide adaptive management practices, which could include appropriate mitigations to protect the social and physical resources.

provided and the existing boat ramp is widened to 2 or 3 trailer spaces.

These two additions would be relatively easy to construct and would go a long way to alleviating a problem that must be addressed. The need for these enhancements should be obvious to anyone who has witnessed the chaos at the boat ramp on peak weekends. The Bennett Peak boat ramp is an existing facility which needs to be properly managed for the traffic it historically gets. All other Key Actions (Nos. 5, 6, and 7) that were designed to alleviate overcrowding at Bennett Peak should have the No Action option selected. In my opinion, these other additions or enhancements will ultimately just serve to add total users. Isolation and difficult access are, and should continue to be used as, a fairly effective means of naturally limiting total users on the river.

In order to further alleviate potential overcrowding on the river in general I urge you to select the following option:

•For Key Action No. 3 (North Platte River SRP Allocations)- please select the No Action I Existing Condition option and continue the moratorium of new SRPs on the North Platte River SRMA. Additionally, the total number of SRPs that are currently issued should be converted into a permanent cap on the issuance of SRPs at the current level of twenty (20) total.

As witnessed in the meeting of May 16, regardless of what the currently targeted "acceptable numbers of encountered craft" is set at by the BLM (specifically 22 craft), it does not seem to me that anyone currently using the river finds this to be an acceptable number of boats to encounter, I know that I certainly do not. Also, an obvious fact that was reiterated by the BLM in the May 16 meeting is that the BLM has no ability to control the number of private individuals or the number of outfitters accessing the river using private land. Additionally, the BLM has no current method of limiting private boaters accessing the river using BLM lands. Since the number of river users in both of these categories has and will inevitably increase, the BLM must do the only thing it is currently capable of towards limiting the number of future users and that is limit the SRPs to the total number that are currently issued.

It came as a shock when informed at the May 16 meeting that there are no quotas or limits set with the issuance of any individual SRP, thus the number of people using the river via the currently issued SRPs can already theoretically increase without limit. Additionally, as stated in the meeting, there are currently some idle SRPs. If this is the case there is obviously not some level of customer demand for guided trips that has been exceeded.

I am confident the BLM already realizes that the Upper North Platte River floating experience is widely considered to be unique

due to a combination of the following factors:

1) The scenery and diversity thereof.
2) Wildlife viewing opportunities.
3) World-class trout fishing opportunities.
4) The relative solitude currently enjoyed.

Overcrowding on the river serves to degrade all of these experiences except the scenery. I urge you to make decisions that will preserve these experiences as a whole by doing what you can to limit increased overcrowding in the future and that is to curtail any increase in commercial use. The BLM has no obligation or responsibility to provide business opportunities that take advantage of the resources of the public to every single individual or entity that desires to do so.

The most recent surveys as conducted by the BLM seem to indicate a high level of satisfaction for most users when questioned about their overall their river experience. Please do not allow this level of satisfaction to lead one into thinking that increased use will still be acceptable. At the point in time when surveys indicate that most users are unsatisfied, it may be too late to remedy the situation and restore the unique total experience which we recreational users are now accustomed to and which is also the main attraction for those that are floating commercially as well.

Mitch Bangert, Harrison's Guest House and Guide Services	Very disappointed that neither Dennis or Chris took me up on my offer to work with them on the RAMP. I have over thirty years of river, public lands experience in this region of the Rocky Mountains and have seen what ease of access can do to areas as far as degrading the expedience of being in these areas and the actual physical abuse of the areas themselves. The North Platte river offers ton's of easy public access from the Colorado boarder to Casper. There is, in my mind, no reason to spend the money or the time to ease access opportunities, any more than what already exists from Bennett upstream to the boarder. This area has protected itself for years by being tough to get to ... people who use it don't mind beating up their rigs or legs to get there and enjoy a quality wilderness type experience .... it's a small river up there, opening it up further could prove fatal to the experience I and thousands of others have enjoyed. Enlarging the boat ramp at Bennett, improving river access at Corral Creek won't do what you hope for, it's the human condition ... they will fill up your enlarged parking space, boat ramp and improved river access... it won't be long before the complaints will come to you again about crowding and the rough road. You might as well make it a 10 wide boat ramp, 10 acre parking area and another 10 wide boat ramp at	RFO-NPRRAMPEA-CR005: The BLM acknowledges your lack of support for the improvements to river access proposed in the Preferred Alternatives for Key Actions 4 (Additional Parking Lot and Boat Ramp at Bennett Peak Campground) and 5 (Improvement of Corral Creek Campground). The BLM has and would continue to monitor visitor capacity and conflicts at Bennett Peak Boat Ramp to determine whether objectives for the SRMA are being met. If future social and resource conditions approach exceedances of these objectives after implementation of any of the alternatives considered in Key Actions 4 and 5, the BLM would provide adaptive management practices, which could include appropriate mitigations to protect the social and physical resource. Treasure Island take-out is not managed by the BLM. Wilderness values/objectives are not included within the setting objectives for the North Platte River SRMA. Commercial outfitting is frequently conducted on the Upper North Platte River, including Prospect Creek and Bennett Peak, and use levels are consistent with the social and resource conditions which are provided under BLM guidelines for the current Middle Country recreation setting objectives identified in the 2008 RFO RMP (see Appendix C, pg. 102). Without maintenance of other river access roads, the concentration of use at Bennett Peak boat ramp would likely cause an exceedance of setting objectives and future conflicts (for the Bennett Peak to Treasure Island section of the Upper North Platte River). Most of the complaints brought to the BLM by the visiting public within the SRMA, concern the current parking congestion and launch waiting times at Bennett Peak Boat Ramp. The BLM considered the Preferred Alternative for Key Action 6 (Improvement of Prospect Creek Undeveloped Recreation Site) because

Corral Creek and pave the road ... that should satisfy the crowds for a couple of more years any how. In all seriousness as an example, you live in a 1200 sq ft home, feel you need more room, you buy the 2400 sq ft home, in very short order that 2400 sq ft if as full to over filled as your 1200 sq ft home ... you see ??? This is not something I've pulled out of my hat, you and I have seen it happen in the house scenario, I've seen it happen time and time again with access being opened up in different forest areas and river areas. You can't change human nature and your preferred alternatives on the upper North Platte River certainly have the potential to destroy what has so happily existed up here for so long. PS: what's going to happen at Treasure Island with the increased load????

Improve Prospect access road for Safety ???? It's a tough road, but if it's not raining and you take a rig down there that is meant to be there, there is no safety issue. My God if the BLM and Forest Service went around to every tough 4 wheel drive road and made it " safer " there would be no need for four wheel drive, high clearance vehicles. I understand if your trying to make that road Toyota Prius accessible, go ahead and pave it. As an example ... Hack's Tackles guides are in there all day long and for years with his Suburbans ... it can't be that tough of a road if a cozy, big ole SUV can come in and out of Prospect all the time ???? Climbing mountains is a hazardous undertaking but please don't put in hand rails or carpeted steps on the trails going up

of the following reasons:

Access to Prospect Creek Undeveloped Recreation Site on the Prospect Creek Road currently has safety concerns frequently reported by the public (vehicles frequently damaged and public stranded in a remote location; towing very difficult due to slope and road conditions).
The Prospect Creek drainage does not meet the BLM RFO's Watershed Assessment Standards due to the erosive conditions of the road. Sedimentation caused by these road conditions is entering the North Platte River and resulting in negative impacts to the fishery.

Maintenance of this road was approved in the 1985 RAMP; therefore, any general maintenance (i.e., water bars, filling in depressions) to the road would be considered under the No Action/ Existing Condition Alternative, as well as the Preferred Alternative. There are currently no plans to pave Prospect Creek Road. Should the Preferred Alternative be selected, most of the road would remain a primitive, four-wheel drive two-track.

The BLM acknowledges your comment regarding Key Action 3: North Platte River SRP Allocations). The 1985 Recreation Area Management Plan designated Prospect, Big Creek, and Bennett Peak Recreation Sites as Semi-Primitive Motorized recreation settings using the USFS Recreation Opportunity Spectrum. The entire SRMA was designated as a Middle Country setting using the BLM's Recreation Setting Characteristics Matrix (see IM2011-004_att5) in the 2008 Rawlins RMP (pg. 2-27).

The above matrix provides guidelines for Middle Country settings to include an average of 15-29 encounters with other craft en route. RFO Management and the NPRRAMP Sounding Board have determined that the limit for Middle Country to be an average of this range (22 encounters).

After receiving and considering numerous written comments and the Chamber of Commerce meeting, as well as the SRP growth forecast

Medicine Bow Peak. And if your actually concerned about erosion and run off you don't maintain and improve that existing road, it would need a complete face lift and rerouting ...the road the way it exists will always erode and will be a continued maintenance nightmare for the BLM. Don't see an overwhelming safety or environmental concern there at all.

So you still want to add outfitters until reaching the Mid Country limits of, I forget 20 or 22 encounters a day, per trip. I have yet to have anyone tell me who or why you came up with the 20 plus encounters a day and that, that number is acceptable. I would like to know the process in coming up with that number and who signed off on it as being acceptable for that small upper river and the people who would be enjoying each others company???????? Please! I have to say it was telling at the meeting where I paid for the venue and the advertising and held at the PVCC that Dennis said out loud that to change from mid country to primitive and limiting the encounters to 6 - 8 a day would be " torture to redo " or something very similar to that .... I think the hard work or torture to redo something to make it right, or to investigate it more thoroughly is not too much to ask of BLM employees.

In closing, I'm not asking that you take opportunities away from the public to enjoy their public lands ... the opportunities are there, they can access all these areas NOW .... you just don't need to make every inch of public

model, the BLM deemed it necessary to change the Preferred Alternative for Key Action 3. Under the Preferred Alternative, the number of new SRPs considered for the waiting list was reduced form 6 to 3 every other year."

Currently, a Primitive Recreation Setting is not being considered within the range of alternatives for Key Action 3.

	land easy to get to! Save some of our more beautiful areas for the people who don't mind working a bit for their recreation.	
R. Richard (Dick) Perue	Boat-in Campground-Only a primitive campsite with boundary signs proposed-If this refers to the Bennett Peak Campground and boat ramp, leave it as it is, or at the most widen the boat launch. If you improve the river access and parking at Corral Creek (blue circle on map below) that could be a take-out boat area only with Bennett Peak Campground a boat-in ramp only. Corral Creek Campground-Develop horse corrals and improve river access. If you must have horse corrals put them to the east-on the meadow between the two streams forming Corral Creek (horse dung colored oval on map below). Of course, this won't require road access or vehicle parking. When I'm camping the last thing I want is a corral full of horses crapping on the ground and attracting flies. Prospect Undeveloped Recreation Site-Improve access road for safety, and reduce resource damage from erosion and run-off.-Good idea. One that was proposed years ago, but the Forest Service put a stop to it. There was an old road which worked great before the FS shut it off. Big Creek Undeveloped Recreation Site-Maintain existing access on current two-track connecting Forest Service Road 211.-Good idea. Here's another idea, open up the old road	Key Action 1 (Boat-In Campground) does not consider any projects at Bennett Peak Campground. It is proposed to be located in Township 19N, 85W, Section 22. The BLM acknowledges your comment that Corral Creek boat launch be a take-out boat ramp only and that Bennett Peak boat ramp be a boat launch only ramp. Your suggestion was considered by the NPRRAMP ID Team in 2012 and eliminated from further consideration by RFO Management due to manageability concerns. The BLM acknowledges your support of the Preferred Alternative for Key Action 6: Improvement of Prospect Creek Undeveloped Recreation Site. The BLM acknowledges your support of the Preferred Alternative for Key Action 7: Improvement of Big Creek Undeveloped Recreation Site. The BLM acknowledges your suggestion for river access to be provided between Moores and Corral creeks for access to the "school section." Your suggestion was considered by the NPRRAMP ID Team in 2012 and eliminated from further consideration because the shoreline areas at School Creek are within sections of private land (i.e., T15N, R82W, S36).

	across BLM ground between Moores and Corral creeks for access to the school section (shown in blue with oval). Of course the ideal boat launch would be from the school section just east of the French Creek Road (Cty 660) and west of the river. No camping, limited parking and both in and out boat ramp and opening up lots of great public fishing through floating and by foot.	
Mitch Bangert, Harrison's Guest House and Guide Services	Two questions as an addendum to my previous comment on the RAMP. 1. How many initial comments did you get after extending the comment period after my meeting at the PVCC and how do I see them. Serena on the radio commented that most comments were for your preferred alternative .. yet while talking to folks from Ryan Ranch, A Cross Ranch and A Bar A and countless others they explained to us there were hundreds of comments that wouldn't be for your preferred alternative ... I would like to be able to access all comments. I'm collecting sent emails that were saved after sending them to the BLM. 2. After checking with the Town of Saratoga, the Valley Chamber and Fish & Game ... why is it that the BLM did not work with cooperating agencies to brain storm together your RAMP preferred alternatives as promised or at least was being considered by Dennis. You can email me back with how to access the comments or call the number in my signature below.	All comments received during the comment extension are included as part of the RAMP/EA in the Addendum to Appendix I: Public and Agency Comments. BLM Responses and can be viewed online at the following url: http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/info/NEPA/documents/rfo/n_platte_ramp.html Below is the indication of support for alternatives provided by the attendees of the Chamber of Commerce meeting:

Key Action	No Action	Preferred	Alt 1	Alt 2
1	3	20	2	
2	3	19		1
3	4	14		4
4	3	21	1	
5	4	23		1
6	10	13	3	
7	10	11	6	

Thank you for your help.

The majority of comments submitted during the comment extension period supported the No Action/Existing Condition Alternative for Key Action 7: Improvement of Big Creek Undeveloped Recreation Site; therefore, after further internal BLM review and consideration of these comments, this alternative was removed from further consideration. There may have been some confusion because of the difference between the comments indicating support for the various alternatives among Chamber of Commerce attendees (above table) versus comments submitted during the extension period.

Interested agencies were invited to attend agency meetings, have provided guidance during meetings, and have submitted comments (see Summary of Scoping on pg. 11 of the NPRRAMP EA). The NPRRAMP Sounding Board Members included Carbon County, Town of Saratoga, and USFS. The BLM also worked closely with other interested agencies and municipalities including WGFD, WY DEQ, Carbon Country Sheriff, City of Encampment, City of Riverside, City of Rawlins, Carbon County Commissioners, U.S. Representative for WY, State Senator for Wyoming, U.S. Senator for WY, and State of WY House of Representatives.

Garry Miller, The Overland Trail Cattle Company	TOTCO owns and operates The Overland Trail Ranch (Ranch), which encompasses about 500 square miles of private, state and federal land within the checkerboard of land ownership in Carbon County, Wyoming. Approximately 26 river miles of the North Platte River lie within the Ranch boundary, representing about one-quarter of the 110 river miles addressed in the RAMP/EA; therefore, TOTCO is the owner of a significant portion of the land and resources potentially affected by the proposed actions outlined in the document. As the largest private land owner on the upper North Platte River, TOTCO has a significant interest in the RAMP. For Key Action 1, Boat-In Campground, TOTCO supports the No Action/Existing Condition Alternative. TOTCO strongly objects to Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 (identified as the Preferred Alternative). The boat-in campground described in	The BLM acknowledges TOTCO's support for the No Action/Existing Condition Alternative for Key Action 1: Boat-in Campground and your opposition to Alternatives 1 and 2 (Preferred Alternative). Under state law, the North Platte River surface water and the natural river channel are open to public navigation. BLM administered public lands within the North Platte River SRMA are not within the ownership of private landowners and the existing condition allows public access to these public lands via navigation of the river. The proposed actions for Key Action 1: Boat-in Campground would not affect private lands surrounding the proposed site more than the existing condition as a dispersed camping area. During the summer of 2013 ID Team on-site, it was observed that there were numerous existing rock fire rings, user trails, two-tracks, and evidence of historical camping. Under the Preferred Alternative, there would only be signs marking private/public boundaries and the location of the site itself. These signs would be placed to mitigate/deter trespass of the public onto private lands. Trespass onto private lands is covered under state law, which is administered, by the State of Wyoming. The proposed presence of private/public boundary signs and the designation of a boat-in campground would foreseeably prevent trespass relative to the existing condition of dispersed camping. The No Action/Existing Condition Alternative would be a similar environmental consequence in regards to law enforcement and public safety as would the Preferred Alternative. As a maintenance action, BLM plans to remark the private public boundaries on other dispersed BLM-administered public lands (up and downstream of the proposed site for the Boat-in Campground). Law enforcement and public safety would be similarly administered on these dispersed areas of public lands. Wildfire risk and emergency response would be similar to the No Action/Existing Condition for the Preferred Alternative in Key Action 1. Campfires are already permitted at dispersed camping sites on public lands, within the limits of issued fire restrictions. Please reference the following address for dispersed camping rules on BLM-administered public lands in Wyoming: http://www.blm.gov/pgdata/etc/medialib/blm/wy/information/docs.Par.1775.File.dat/wynf-0019.pdf

Alternatives 1 and 2 is located on public lands within the Overland Trail Ranch. The adjoining private lands are owned by TOTCO and the public lands are within TOTCO's Pine Grove/Bolten Grazing Allotment	Year-round BLM Wyoming fire restrictions are in effect for all BLM-Administered Public Lands: http://www.wy.blm.gov/wy_fire_restrictions/federal/year_round.htm Additional fire restrictions may be announced as fire risks increase: http://www.wy.blm.gov/wy_fire_restrictions/ Potential impacts from human waste under the Preferred Alternative would be similar to those of the No Action/Existing Condition. As previously stated, it is expected the proposed Leave-No-Trace program would help mitigate and deter the public from leaving exposed areas of human waste along the river.
(#10623). There is no public access or BLM administrative access to the public lands except boat-in access on the North Platte River.	Leave-No-Trace education has been proven to be effective at mitigating human waste disposal: http://lnt.org/teach/research Preliminary results suggest that Wyoming residents are willing to follow Leave-No-Trace principles: http://lnt.org/blog/leave-no-trace-effectiveness-research-begins-wyoming
Section VIII B (Environmental Consequences - Recreation) of the RAMP and EA states that the proposed action (Alternative 2) would be beneficial to law enforcement and public safety. TOTCO disagrees. To respond to an incident at the boat-in campground requiring law enforcement (LE) or search and rescue (SAR) assistance, responders would either need to helicopter into the camp site (assuming there exists a suitable landing zone and a	

helicopter is locally available) or boat-in via the North Platte River. Either way, LE or SAR response is likely to be slow and cumbersome which endangers public safety. A recent incident on the river requiring SAR assistance provides a real life example illustrating this point. Our understanding is that reaching the injured party required the majority of the day, and the person was floated out.

Additionally, the BLM intends to allow campfires at this location. In the event a campfire is not properly attended or is not fully extinguished upon leaving the area, a wildfire could result. Emergency response to such a fire would be hampered by lack of access possibly resulting in the fire burning large areas causing potential significant adverse effects to public safety, grazing, wildlife, fisheries (through erosion), vegetation and soils. The RAMP and EA inadequately evaluates the risk of wildfire resulting

from implementation of Alternatives 1 and 2 of Key Action 1 and fails to fully analyze the effects such fires. TOTCO believes the adverse impacts of such effects outweigh the benefit of establishing a boat-in campground under Alternatives 1 and 2. The RAMP and EA should analyze such potentially significant adverse impacts. If the Preferred Alternative is implemented, BLM should ban campfires at the boat-in campground as metal fire rings are insufficient to adequately reduce the risk of wildfires.

Alternatives 1 and 2 would also serve to concentrate use at one area along the river. Such concentrated use may reasonably be expected to result in excessive amounts of human waste and trash causing undue and unnecessary degradation of public lands. While BLM may encourage carry-in/carry-out of human waste and litter through implementation of Key

Action 2: Leave-No- Trace Education, the RAMP and EA presents no evidence of the effectiveness of such educational programs and how such measures will be enforced. The BLM's conclusory statement that implementation of Key Action 2 will mitigate the level of human waste (presumably to levels of non-significance although this is not stated) is not supported by the RAMP and EA.

Alternative 1 of Key Action 1 is particularly troublesome. Establishing a fully developed boat-in campground (fire rings, grills, tent pads, trails and toilet) with no access except for boat-in river access is impractical and not a reasonable alternative. BLM's lack of ability to properly police and maintain the campground will result in undue and unnecessary degradation of public lands. The BLM must not pursue Alternative 1 of Key Action 1 and should drop this

alternative from any further consideration.

Implementation of Alternatives 1 and 2 of Key Action 1 can reasonably be expected to result in additional trespass on private lands. While placing boundary markers and signage on public lands may help in educating the public, TOTCO's experience with the Rochelle Easement has been that signage and public education alone do not adequately prevent trespass as attested to by a number of cut locks and fences. Besides being illegal, trespass can result in resource damage. For example, repeated foot traffic may trample vegetation and cause soil erosion. Such resource damage may have an adverse impact on TOTCO's grazing operations and allotments which, if not properly monitored and controlled, could have a significant impact.

The No Action Alternative for Key Action 1 allows continued use of bank-side picnicking and other recreational uses on public lands adjacent to the river, while promoting dispersed use along the river. Combined with Key Action 2, Leave-No-Trace Education, boaters will be afforded the opportunity to enjoy the North Platte River as it meanders through the valley while respecting private property rights and the area's traditional culture and heritage of ranching and farming. TOTCO supports the No Action Alternative for Key Action 1.

The RAMP and EA do not adequately support the issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact based on the deficiencies identified above. TOTCO believes that the BLM should either reject the action alternatives for Key Action 1 by selecting the No Action Alternative in its Decision Record, or proceed to prepare an environmental impact statement as required

	under the National Environmental Policy Act.	
John D. Farr (#2)	Comment Description #C006: The PUBLIC was preomised in May thatr the project would be approved, diaapproved or would go back to the "cooperators" for discussion. None of those three were done. This project will create more problems than it solves and takes no responsibility for the problems created. It should be junked. A North Platte River Master Plan for the valley from Semionoe to the Wyoming State Line should be created with ALL the people along the river involved--not just fee paying guides. This River has a capacity and it must be respected. P.S. I never got any email from the last comment period. I was one of the organizers. Do you draw straws for notification?	NPRAMPEA-CR006 All interested agencies were invited to participate in the planning process. NPRRAMP EA drafts were announced to media accessible to the general public. Any public meetings held during the planning process were open to general members of the public. All comments were reviewed and considered in the planning process.

Gwen Booth, WGFD	The staff of the Wyoming Game and Fish Department has reviewed the Environmental Assessment for the Revised North Platte River Recreation Area Management Plan. We have no additional concerns pertaining to the revised North Platte River recreation area management plan.	The BLM acknowledges the WGFD's provision of no comments on the NPRRAMP EA during this comment period ending on Sept. 6, 2013.